

Bulletin
of
The American Association
of
University Professors

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Thomas F. Green, Jr.

E. C. Kirkland
Richard J. Purcell

Louise Pound

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

W. T. LAPRADE (*History*) Duke University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER (*French Literature*) Johns Hopkins University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

ZECHARIAH CHAFER, JR. (*Law*) Harvard University

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

THOMAS F. GREEN, JR. (*Law*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1940-1942

FRANK L. GRIFFIN (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Reed College
FOWLER V. HARPER (<i>Law</i>)	Indiana University
HELEN SARD HUGHES (<i>English</i>)	Wellesley College
JOHN ISE (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Kansas
G. W. MARTIN (<i>Botany</i>)	State University of Iowa
ROY F. NICHOLS (<i>History</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
H. L. OSTERUD (<i>Anatomy</i>)	Medical College of Virginia
HARALD S. PATTON (<i>Economics</i>)	Michigan State College
HORATIO SMITH (<i>French</i>)	Columbia University
MARIE J. WEISS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Tulane University of Louisiana

1941-1943

WILLIAM A. BROWNELL (<i>Educational Psychology</i>)	Duke University
JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Hunter College
CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN (<i>English</i>)	Mount Holyoke College
CHARLES L. JAMISON (<i>Business Administration</i>)	University of Michigan
JOHN A. KINNEMAN (<i>Sociology</i>)	Illinois State Normal University
ETHEL SABIN-SMITH (<i>Psychology, Philosophy</i>)	Mills College
STANLEY S. SWARTLEY (<i>English</i>)	Allegheny College
JOHN A. VIEG (<i>Government</i>)	Iowa State College
PAUL W. WARD (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Syracuse University
E. J. WORKMAN (<i>Physics</i>)	University of New Mexico

1942-1944

C. RAYMOND ADAMS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Brown University
M. M. BOBER (<i>Economics</i>)	Lawrence College
WALTHER I. BRANDT (<i>History</i>)	The City College (New York)
EUGENE PARKER CHASE (<i>Political Science</i>)	Lafayette College
H. G. DEMING (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Nebraska
RUSSELL PARSONS JAMESON (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Oberlin College
A. LADRU JENSEN (<i>Law</i>)	University of Utah
*ARTHUR L. KEITH (<i>Latin</i>)	University of South Dakota
GEORGE POPE SHANNON (<i>English</i>)	University of Alabama
A. CURTIS WILGUS (<i>Hispanic American History</i>)	George Washington University

EX-PRESIDENTS

A. J. CARLSON (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Chicago
MARK H. INGRAHAM (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Wisconsin
FREDERICK S. DRIBLER (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University

* Deceased.

CONTENTS

CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	172
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE—WINTHROP COLLEGE...	173
SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, <i>John B. St. John</i> and <i>Rainard B. Robbins</i>	197
VITAMINS FOR THE VETERAN TEACHER, <i>Laurens H. Seelye</i> ..	223
PH.D.'s AND POSITIONS, <i>Ernest V. Hollis</i>	231
FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN TIME OF WAR, <i>Wendell Berge</i>	239
PROFESSORS ADMINISTRANT, <i>DR Scott</i>	247
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Exchange of Correspondence with Brazilian Professors...	257
Regional Meetings.....	257
Chapter Activities.....	262
Representatives.....	263
REVIEWS	
Free Speech in the United States, <i>Zechariah Chafee, Jr.</i> ...	265
American Journalism: A History of Newspapers in the United States through 250 Years, <i>Frank Luther Mott</i> ...	271
They Went to College, <i>C. Robert Pace</i>	273
Public Schools and British Opinion Since 1860, <i>Edward C. Mack</i>	275
An Adventure in Education: Swarthmore College under Frank Aydelotte, <i>the Swarthmore College Faculty</i>	278
Publications Received.....	287
COMMENTS ON "XENOGLOTTOPHOBIA".....	290
CONTRIBUTORS.....	296
MEMBERSHIP.....	297
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	304

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATIONAL INDEX.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana (<i>Bulletin</i> , April, 1938, pp. 321-348; December, 1939, pp. 578-584; February, 1940, pp. 73-91; December, 1940, pp. 602-606)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College, West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940
Western Washington College of Education (Board of Trustees), Bellingham, Washington (February, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 48-60)	December, 1941

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

WINTHROP COLLEGE

On June 5, 1941 Dr. Helen G. Macdonald, Head of the Department of Government and Sociology at Winthrop College, the State college for women of South Carolina, requested advice of the American Association of University Professors, stating that she was under threat of dismissal. Professor William M. Hepburn, then Associate Secretary of the Association, by correspondence sought from Dr. Shelton Phelps, President of Winthrop College, information concerning the status of Dr. Macdonald on the faculty of the College. Several letters and one telegram to President Phelps failed to produce any information beyond the statement that the College would not cooperate in what it regarded as an unwarranted interference by an outside agency.

On July 8 Dr. Macdonald received notice of nonappointment for the next academic year and so informed the Association. On the same date Dr. Elizabeth Lee Harris, Assistant Professor of English, received similar notice of nonappointment, and on July 9 she referred her dismissal to the Association.

On July 16 Professor Hepburn wrote again to President Phelps asking for information in reference to both dismissals and attempting at some length to correct President Phelps' mistaken idea of the functions of the Association in the matter of faculty dismissals. A second letter was written by Professor Hepburn on July 28 requesting a reply to his July 16 letter and asking if the College would receive an investigating committee should the Association appoint one. President Phelps replied on July 29 that "the Winthrop College Board of Trustees, the regular constituted authority for the government of Winthrop, has no intention whatever of referring to your agency through a special committee, or otherwise, this function."

On October 22 an Investigating Committee was appointed consisting of Professor Newman I. White (English) of Duke

University, Chairman, and Professor William M. Hepburn (Law) of the University of Alabama. Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, then wrote to President Phelps asking if he would receive the Committee. President Phelps replied on October 27 quoting from two former letters in which he refused to receive representatives of the Association and concluding:

We will not refer this matter of the action taken by the Winthrop Board . . . to this committee which you have appointed. We will not receive this committee.

On November 24 the General Secretary wrote to President Phelps to inform him of the time of the arrival of the Investigating Committee. In this letter he said:

My associates and I have given careful consideration to your October 27 letter. We regret that you do not choose to present the administration's side of these two dismissals. We hope that you will reconsider and that we may have the benefit of your cooperation. We shall, of course, conduct our inquiry even though we do not have your cooperation. We intend to use every proper means at our disposal to obtain complete information about these two dismissals and about tenure conditions, in general, at Winthrop College. If the facts justify it, we may wish to make this information available to the academic world by publication in our *Bulletin*. If our efforts to obtain pertinent information are obstructed, we shall, of course, note that fact in any subsequent publication.

We have never requested you to "refer" the matter of the action taken by the Winthrop College Board in reference to Miss Macdonald and Miss Harris to this Association for *action*. We have merely requested information to the end that we may be able to determine whether these two teachers have been dealt with justly and in accordance with good academic practice. . . .

Before visiting the College the Investigating Committee studied a considerable mass of documents already accumulated in reference to the two dismissals, held several personal interviews, and collected a number of statements by correspondence. A questionnaire designed to elicit facts and opinions on all the basic issues that seemed to be involved was prepared and sent to all the mem-

bers of the regular faculty of Winthrop College several days before the Committee's visit. With this questionnaire was sent a letter explaining the Committee's desire to arrive at a full and just understanding of the facts and requesting that the recipient send or bring his answer to a local hotel and state whether or not he was willing to be interviewed by the Committee. Out of about 100 questionnaires sent, 48 were answered.

Prior to the Committee's visit letters were written to the President and the Trustees explaining its action in sending the questionnaire to members of the faculty, enclosing copies of it, and requesting interviews. None of these letters was answered.

After the Committee's arrival on November 27 in Rock Hill, where Winthrop College is located, President Phelps was reached by telephone, but he declined to meet with the Committee to discuss the case and demanded to know "by what authority it had sent questionnaires" to members of his faculty and "summoned" them to interviews. Dr. Mowat G. Fraser, Dean of the College, could not be reached by telephone though repeated efforts were made. The Committee was informed that he had left town shortly after its arrival. Of the two Trustees who lived in Rock Hill, one was ill and the other declined to see the Committee. The Trustees had held a meeting the day before the Committee arrived, and were reported to have agreed not to see the Committee. When the Trustee who had declined an interview was asked to confirm or deny this report, he made no direct answer, but stated that he thought it would be useless to seek interviews.

Because of these unprecedented conditions of a complete official boycott the Committee has not had the benefit of facts and records usually made available to the Association's visiting committees, and has been handicapped in its efforts to obtain the administration's reasons for the dismissals of Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Harris.

During its visit in Rock Hill the Committee interviewed 21 persons, mostly members of the faculty. Four alumnae were interviewed at their own request. No students were interviewed. Since its visit the Committee has held several other interviews and has received a considerable number of letters from alumnae and from former members of the faculty. On the basis of this

accumulation of facts and opinions the Committee offers this report.

Pursuant to the Association's regular procedure a tentative report of the investigation was sent on March 13, 1942 to President Phelps, Dr. Macdonald, and Dr. Harris for correction of possible factual errors and comment to the end that "if publication should eventuate, the report published will be factually accurate." Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Harris responded promptly to this invitation to assist in the verification of facts. After a delay of three weeks, and in reply to a telegram from the General Secretary, President Phelps wrote on April 8 as follows:

Replying to your telegram of March 31, received during my absence from my office, I have at present no comment to make.

(On account of the high state of nervousness and apprehension exhibited by many witnesses, the Committee has thought it wise throughout this report to avoid the use of names as far as possible and to use only the masculine pronoun in referring to unidentified witnesses.)

II

Winthrop College is located at Rock Hill, a small city in the piedmont region of the State of South Carolina. It has a student body of over 1800 and a faculty of about 100, exclusive of administrative officers and about 20 members of the Training School faculty. Its plant and equipment are valued at \$4,055,000, and its income is derived from student fees and grants from the State Legislature.

The College grew out of a small teachers training school, founded in Columbia, South Carolina in 1886 by Dr. David Bancroft Johnson, then Superintendent of the Columbia city schools. Five years later this school was taken over by the State, and its income and activities were expanded. In 1895 it was removed to Rock Hill, and a four-year curriculum was instituted. The College now offers the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Sciences. Its catalogue states that the College is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Association of

American Colleges, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Women, and that it is on the approved list of the Association of American Universities.

The College is governed by a Board of Trustees, consisting of seven members elected by the State Legislature¹ and four *ex-officio* members: *viz.*, the Governor, the State Superintendent of Education, and the Chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Education. The President is elected by the Trustees.

Dr. Johnson, the founder, continued as President until his death in 1928. It appears that, far more than is usually the case, Dr. Johnson expected, received, and deserved the strong loyalty of faculty, students, and alumnae. He possessed an extraordinary knowledge of the College's equipment and personnel. He is Winthrop's greatest tradition.

Dr. Johnson was succeeded as President by Dr. James Pinckney Kinard, who was President from 1928 until the election of the present incumbent, Dr. Shelton Joseph Phelps, in 1934. Dr. Kinard, as President was, according to most testimony, a kindly, amiable gentleman but, unlike Dr. Johnson, not a vigorous administrator.

When it became evident that Dr. Kinard was to be succeeded in the presidency, two members of the faculty offered themselves as candidates for this position, and actively solicited support among the faculty and the alumnae. One of these candidates was Dr. Warren G. Keith, Head of the Department of History, who was privately but strongly encouraged by one or more members of the Board of Trustees. A petition in his favor was circulated among the members of the faculty, a few of whom signed it, but a large majority of the faculty became alarmed and signed a petition asking the Trustees not to choose the new President from among the faculty. Dr. Phelps was accordingly called from the position of Dean of the Graduate School of George Peabody College for Teachers. Dr. Kinard remained on the campus as a salaried President-Emeritus and as an assistant to Dr. Phelps. Dr. Keith, who many of the witnesses believe is responsible in a large measure for the present troubles, continued as a department head.

From the beginning the concept of authority at Winthrop College

¹ Recently, by legislative enactment, the number of elective members was increased to nine.

seems to have been that the Trustees engaged a President in whom they had confidence and thereafter supported his authority without any question. The faculty as a body appears never to have had a real part in the affairs of the College, particularly during the administration of President Phelps. The faculty is recognized in the government of the College principally in the existence of nine committees appointed by the President of the College. These committees, whose functions are purely advisory, appear to be dominated by and to represent the administration rather than the faculty. The President and the President-Emeritus are *ex-officio* members of all committees, and the President is in addition specifically named a member of three committees. The Registrar, the Executive Secretary of the Alumnae Association (college paid), the Dean of Women, the Dean of the College, the Secretary to the Registrar, the Business Manager, and the two department heads who are distrusted by many members of the faculty for their alleged autocratic behavior are all members of one or more of these nine committees.

It is obvious that committees so constituted do not represent free faculty opinion and that a faculty member, in offering views contrary to those of the administration, might easily feel that he was making himself a marked person. This was admitted somewhat unwillingly by committee members who were in no sense critical of the administration.

III

Dr. Helen G. Macdonald is a graduate of Queens University, of Kingston, Canada with the B.A. and the M.A. degrees, and a graduate of Columbia University with the Ph.D. degree (1926). In 1927 Dr. Macdonald went to Winthrop College with the rank of Professor as Head of the Department of Political and Social Science, later known as the Department of Government and Sociology. Until a few months before her dismissal Dr. Macdonald had received no intimation that her position was in any way insecure. On February 28, 1941 President Phelps asked Dr. Macdonald if he might tell the Board of Trustees that she was willing to take out citizenship papers. She immediately replied that he might do so. On March 12 he wrote to her as follows:

The Board desires that if you continue in your present professorship that [*sic*] you achieve at the earliest possible time United States citizenship.

President Phelps was quoted to Dr. Macdonald by Dean Fraser as saying that a South Carolina law forbade the teaching of American government by an alien. Dr. Macdonald investigated and found that no such law existed; nevertheless, she proceeded immediately and willingly to apply for American citizenship. She was then told that she could continue to teach sociology but not government.

It had always been known that Dr. Macdonald was a Canadian citizen, but previous to March 12, 1941 it had not been suggested by anyone that this fact affected her qualifications as a teacher of American government. Her graduate work at Columbia University had been in the field of government and history.

By this time Dr. Macdonald had become alarmed. Feeling that her loyalty to the United States was being questioned, she sought interviews with three members of the Board of Trustees in order to clarify her status on the faculty of the College. These three Trustees consented to talk with her, received her cordially, and listened to her politely. No one of them warned her that in coming to them she might be considered as violating the By-Law which was subsequently invoked by President Phelps to justify her dismissal. On June 3, 1941 President Phelps wrote to Dr. Macdonald as follows:

You are hereby notified that in regard to electing a teacher for next year, for the teaching position which you held last year, the decision of the Board was deferred until an adjourned meeting of the Board.

This decision will be made after the Board has had sufficient time to consider fully and reach a decision regarding your own violation of the By-Laws of the College. . . . your individual visits to the members of the Board not going through the President of the College.

The By-Law (Chapter II, Section 10) was then quoted as follows:

He (the President) shall be the organ of communication between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees, and between the College and the public. All official communications and requests, addressed to the Board, shall be made through the President.

In this letter President Phelps invited Dr. Macdonald to "explain fully" to him either in conference or by letter. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees on June 2 the President was instructed to call the faculty's attention to this By-Law. This instruction might indicate either that the Board of Trustees knew that the faculty was not aware of this By-Law or that the Board considered it unfair to base severe punishment on a By-Law which had never before been enforced. On June 4 President Phelps wrote a letter to each member of the faculty quoting the By-Law and adding:

Please indicate your willingness to abide by this by-law in your acceptance of the position for next year.

Dr. Macdonald states that, until she received President Phelps' letter of June 3, she was unaware of the existence of this By-Law. She knew, and it was common knowledge, according to testimony received by the Investigating Committee, that many members of the faculty were in the habit of speaking with Trustees about personal and college affairs. The Committee found no member of the faculty who knew of the existence of the By-Law prior to President Phelps' letter of June 4, 1941. It is probable that the Trustees interviewed by Dr. Macdonald considered that her conversations with them were personal and not "official communications." At any rate, these three Trustees have been named as the three members of the Board who voted in Dr. Macdonald's favor in subsequent proceedings.

On June 10 Dr. Macdonald wrote to President Phelps in response to his request of June 3 that she "explain fully" her violation of the By-Law. She stated her case, and requested permission to send a copy of her letter to each member of the Board of Trustees, and requested also to be heard in person by the Board of Trustees in case her written statement was unsatisfactory. No answer to this letter was ever received. On July 8 Dr. Macdonald received from the secretary of the Board of Trustees a brief notice

that at an adjourned meeting of the Board on July 5 "you were not elected to a teaching position for the school year 1941-1942." It is significant that this decision of the Board was not unanimous; the vote was four to three.

Professor Hepburn, the Associate Secretary of the Association, telegraphed President Phelps on July 8 asking for information about Dr. Macdonald's dismissal. This telegram, unanswered on account of President Phelps' absence from Rock Hill, was followed on July 16 by a letter asking for information about the dismissals of both Drs. Macdonald and Harris. In this letter Professor Hepburn explained at length that the Association was proceeding upon the basis of recognized good academic practice rather than legal rights, that it had no intention of interfering in the purely internal affairs of the College, but that it was seeking information for the benefit of the teaching profession on the basis of accepted principles of good academic practice.

President Phelps replied on July 28 to both letter and telegram as follows:

Replying to your letter of July 16, received in my office while I was in the summer work conference of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held at Sewanee, Tennessee, and in reply to your inquiries concerning Dr. Helen Macdonald and Dr. Elizabeth Harris, the following are briefly the facts in regard to them.

Dr. Helen Macdonald is an alien of Canadian birth. Some two years ago some questions arose concerning her lack of citizenship. This matter was reported to Dr. Macdonald with the suggestion that she achieve citizenship in the United States as she had been a resident and a teacher in the country. This she seemed reluctant to do. After considerable time had elapsed due to the increase of the criticism regarding her lack of citizenship, the advice was repeated somewhat more urgently. After what seemed considerable reluctance she took first steps toward securing citizenship.

Dr. Macdonald came to Winthrop as a teacher of political science. She has always taught some courses in government. Some time previous to my own coming here she had transferred much of her teaching activities to the field of sociology. So far as I know this transfer was wholly voluntary on her part. Sociology had become a major teaching activity with her, government a minor. I think she taught two sections in government last year. The criticism

of her lack of citizenship centered on the fact that she was teaching government. Due to this situation she was advised to drop the two sections in government and do all of her teaching in sociology. This she protested. She, however, took the matter under consideration and after some days of deliberation came into the office and agreed to the transfer of her teaching activities to sociology. It seems, however, that she took the matter to the Board of Trustees independently of this agreement protesting the transfer. Winthrop has in common with practically all the institutions I know a policy which forbids a teacher to take matters of this kind independently to the Board without bringing them through the office of the President. At the annual commencement meeting of the Board, June 2, Dr. Macdonald's election was held up until an adjourned meeting of the Board pending further consideration of her case. Dr. Macdonald was notified of this and of the cause of the deferment. Upon the convening of the adjourned meeting and the further consideration of her case she was not elected to a teaching position for the ensuing year.

Dr. Elizabeth Harris made herself somewhat active in behalf of Dr. Macdonald. She interviewed one or more members of the Board in Dr. Macdonald's behalf, doing this as in the case of Dr. Macdonald independently of the President. At the annual commencement meeting, June 2, her election similarly was deferred and she was notified of the postponement and its cause. At the adjourned meeting of the Board and upon the further consideration of her case she was not elected to a teaching position.

The Board believes its policy of requiring all such matters to come to the Board through the office of the President a sound one. It does not intend to have teachers going independently and individually to the members of the Board on such matters. It believes that such a policy would result in a situation of individual appeals inimical to the welfare of the college. This I think you can agree is good practice and common practice among institutions.

President Phelps' letter, quoted above, constitutes the only official explanation of the dismissal of either Dr. Macdonald or Dr. Harris. On the point of her Canadian citizenship Dr. Macdonald wrote to the Committee as follows:

This first inquiry concerning my citizenship was made last summer [1940] within the last two weeks of summer school, not two years ago, as stated in Dr. Phelps' letter. . . . The first suggestion that I take out United States citizenship came on February 28 of

this year, at which time Dr. Phelps asked if he might tell the Board that I was willing to take out papers if they desired me to do so. He did not tell me at that time that the Board had previously expressed itself on the subject. I told him without hesitation that I was willing.

As already stated, Dr. Macdonald made application for citizenship papers as soon as she was requested to do so by the Board of Trustees. With respect to President Phelps' statement concerning her courses, she denied that sociology had become a major teaching activity and government a minor activity. She presented figures to the Committee to show the predominance of government in her list of courses. Her statements on this point are supported by a list of courses compiled for the Committee from recent catalogues of the College. For each of the five academic years from 1935 to 1940 she taught seven courses in government and three in sociology. For the academic year 1940-1941 she taught six courses in government and four in sociology. One of her courses in sociology, entitled "Social Legislation," might also be regarded as a course in government.

It is significant to note that the issue of Dr. Macdonald's citizenship was later dropped by President Phelps. He has, however, assigned no other reason for her dismissal except the alleged By-Law violation. The Committee has received a considerable number of oral and written statements from other persons suggesting possible causes for the termination of her services. Prominently asserted as among these causes are the ambitions and the opposition of Dr. Keith, Head of the Department of History, who allegedly wished to absorb Dr. Macdonald's Department of Government and Sociology within his own. His department had already absorbed the courses in economics formerly included in the Department of Government and Sociology.

Administrative spokesmen, including Dr. Keith, claimed that Dr. Macdonald was not a good teacher, that she drove students from her classes by dull, uninspired teaching, and by unduly severe grading. These charges were warmly denied by members of the faculty and by several of Dr. Macdonald's former students, two of whom have written letters to the Committee in which they

characterized Dr. Macdonald's classes as the best they attended at Winthrop College.

On the point of Dr. Macdonald's work as a teacher Dean Fraser's estimate is pertinent. On June 10, 1941 Dr. Macdonald told Dean Fraser that she was contemplating seeking a position elsewhere and asked him for a letter of recommendation. Dean Fraser seemed surprised that she thought of leaving Winthrop College and both orally and by letter expressed the hope that she would remain. In his letter of recommendation he says of her that she has

...an excellent scholastic background...a deep, genuine interest in civic and social needs as well as in the literature of her field. She attends conferences regularly and keeps up to date in every way possible. At the same time, she keeps disinterested enough to maintain a comprehensive view and does not become over-serious concerning contemporary or local problems. This intelligent academic and cultural interest naturally helps to make her teaching vital and has its due effect on the students.

He also says in this letter that she has given "very good service for fourteen years" and that he hopes she will continue to teach at Winthrop College indefinitely.

At the time the letter quoted above was written Dean Fraser appeared to know nothing of the fact that Dr. Macdonald's tenure was then in jeopardy because of the citizenship issue. He probably attributed her uneasiness to President Phelps' letter of June 4 to the faculty which called attention to the By-Law previously quoted. President Phelps' action in this instance in seeking to terminate the tenure of a department head without even consulting the Dean of the College is obviously irregular.

Thus, without a hearing and approximately a month after the close of the academic year, the administration of Winthrop College dismissed a professor, a department head of fourteen years' standing, because of an alleged violation of a By-Law of which she and practically the whole of the faculty had never heard. No sensible teacher or administrator can view this procedure as anything but arbitrary, heartless, and shortsighted. Her dismissal was in total violation of all decent academic practice.

IV

Dr. Elizabeth Lee Harris holds the degrees of B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. from Vanderbilt University. She went to Winthrop College as Assistant Professor of English in 1937 from the College of the Ozarks, where she had been Head of the English Department since 1934. Prior to that time she had been a member of the faculty of Grenada College. Until shortly before her dismissal she was regarded by the authorities of Winthrop College as a brilliant teacher and scholar. That she had the confidence of President Phelps is indicated by the fact that for three years he placed her on the Publications Committee and also on the Freshman Advisory Committee. A year before her dismissal she had been recommended for immediate promotion by Dr. Paul M. Wheeler, Head of the English Department, in the following terms:

Dr. Harris has every qualification for this position: she is a scholar of more than usual attainments, she is a teacher of exceptional ability, she is a refined lady, with an unique wit and a highly developed sense of humor, and she is loyal both to the institution and to her employers.

As late as April 21, 1941 Dr. Wheeler concluded a letter to Dr. Harris as follows:

I think it is the consensus of opinion on the part of the teachers, faculty, and administration that you are doing an exceptionally fine piece of work teaching at Winthrop.

If at this time the administration of the College had any idea of dismissing Dr. Harris, the Head of the Department who would normally be consulted in such matters was totally unaware of it.

But two weeks later the official attitude toward Dr. Harris was greatly altered. Following a conference with President Phelps concerning the possible promotion of Dr. Harris, Dr. Wheeler informed her in a letter dated May 6 that there was "no immediate prospect" of her promotion. In addition, he "most reluctantly" offered her this advice:

If you are completely dissatisfied with your present rank, your wisest course would be to seek another position that would be more to your liking.

When President Phelps engaged another teacher to fill the vacancy for which Dr. Harris had been recommended, she conferred with him and reports that he assured her that there was nothing against her, that her work was appreciated, but that in order to secure the services of the particular teacher he wished to appoint he had had to offer him the higher ranking position.

It was during March and April, it will be recalled, that the issue of Canadian citizenship was raised against Dr. Macdonald. On April 3 and 4 and about April 15 Dr. Macdonald held the fateful interviews with the three Trustees, assigned as the reason for her dismissal. Dr. Harris, who sympathized openly with Dr. Macdonald, interviewed a Trustee on her behalf on May 16. On June 3, 1941 President Phelps wrote to Dr. Harris a letter identical with his letter of the same date to Dr. Macdonald notifying her that a decision as to her appointment for the next year was being referred to an adjourned meeting of the Board and citing her violation of Chapter II, Section 10, of the By-Laws. Dr. Harris replied to this letter on June 7, expressing her opinion that the By-Laws were being manipulated into charges against her, denying any previous knowledge of them and stating that her conduct did not involve "official communications" and was no more than the exercise of constitutional freedom of speech. On July 7 the secretary of the Board of Trustees sent to Dr. Harris a notice of nonappointment identical with the notice sent on the same date to Dr. Macdonald.

As shown by the letter quoted on page 181 above, President Phelps, when questioned about the dismissals of Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Harris, replied concerning Dr. Harris that she "made herself somewhat active in behalf of Dr. Macdonald" and was discharged for infringement of the By-Law already quoted. In both cases he defended the By-Law as necessary for the proper administration of a college.

Persons who criticized Dr. Harris in interviews with the Investigating Committee stated that she has a brilliant mind and

that she is a good teacher, though some added "for the best students only." Some of her critics regard her as being a "crusader" and as one who employs her wit too "recklessly" and "caustically." She has many friends on the faculty, however, who warmly deny the validity of these criticisms. The Investigating Committee has encountered no evidence that any cause championed by her was unworthy of support.

The Investigating Committee feels certain that the real reason for Dr. Harris' dismissal is to be found not in the reasons assigned by President Phelps and the Trustees and not in the general vague allegations made by her subsequent critics but in certain events which occurred in the spring of 1941. Among these is a particular incident which aroused the antagonism of Dr. Keith. Dr. Harris championed the cause of a teacher in the Department of History, who was forced to resign because he voiced disapproval of what he considered to be an overemphasis of an extracurricular activity in which Dr. Keith was personally interested. He felt that students were being encouraged by Dr. Keith to participate in forensics at the expense of their regular work and class attendance, that his own teaching was being made to suffer as the result of the attention which he was compelled to devote to this activity, and that the work of the department as a whole was thereby being impaired. In this connection Dr. Keith is quoted as having said, "In my department history is the handmaid to forensics." When this teacher spoke to President Phelps about the matter, he was assured by the President that his assistance with the extracurricular work in forensics was optional and not a part of the work for which he had been engaged. Later, however, he was summoned from class by President Phelps and told that, because of specific written charges filed against him by Dr. Keith, he should either submit his resignation by the next morning or accept dismissal. He was not, however, permitted to see the charges made against him by Dr. Keith. The teacher elected to resign rather than be dismissed. Dr. Harris spoke openly against the injustice of this forced resignation.

It is relevant to note that Dr. Keith was the only one who was willing to defend the dismissals of Dr. Macdonald and Dr. Harris on the grounds assigned by President Phelps. In the opinion of

Dr. Harris it was due largely to the influence of Dr. Keith that President Phelps came to look upon her with disfavor. Dr. Harris feels that to a lesser extent her disfavor with President Phelps was due to the fact that she made him uncomfortable by interviewing him in the matter of his refusal to give her the promised promotion. It is probable that President Phelps felt that Dr. Harris' attitude was critical of his administration. Her alleged violation of the By-Law furnished soon thereafter a convenient reason for her dismissal.

One of the persons interviewed challenged the Committee to investigate Dr. Harris' earlier record. While this could have no direct bearing on her dismissal from the faculty of Winthrop College and was, therefore, an irrelevancy, the Committee felt that some persons would not be satisfied that the investigation was complete or impartial unless this were done. The Committee, therefore, made a careful inquiry into the facts of Dr. Harris' career before she became a member of the faculty of Winthrop College.

Dean J. R. Countiss, Acting President of Grenada College, on February 23, 1934 wrote of Dr. Harris as follows:

I consider her one of the best teachers I have known in my twenty-five years' experience in college administration. She is sound and thorough in scholarship, popular with the students and her associates in the faculty and loyal to the administration, even to the point of sacrifice. Miss Harris is a young woman of culture and refinement, a lady in every sense of the word. She is a strong personality, genial and genuine, with decided convictions and plenty of courage to maintain them, yet with sufficient modesty and honor to feel that it would be cheating to oversell herself. . . .

On April 28, 1937 President Wiley Lin Hurie of the College of the Ozarks concluded a letter to Dr. Harris with an expression of appreciation for her "attitude" and "fine work." Later, when she resigned to accept her appointment at Winthrop College, he wrote:

While I regret very much to lose you, I can but wish you success and thank you for the fine service you have rendered us during the three years you have been a member of our faculty. The loyal support you have given me is very much appreciated.

Again on September 4, 1937 President Hurie wrote to her:

We are going to miss you greatly here. I hear a great many students and others say that and compliment you very highly on your teaching ability.

To the Chairman of the Investigating Committee, President Hurie wrote on December 20, 1941 as follows:

Miss Harris is a brilliant person and an excellent teacher.... I think she is one of the most stimulating teachers we have had on our faculty. I am glad to state, too, that my personal relations as president...with Miss Harris were always pleasant. I believed in her as a teacher, and I think she believed in me as an administrator.

President Hurie states that he had heard Dr. Harris described as a "bit critical of others" and also rather ready to express to her classes disagreement with "certain addresses or certain policies." This is the only adverse criticism of Dr. Harris' earlier career which the Committee has been able to discover. It was not taken seriously by President Hurie, who states:

I never paid much attention to this, for in our College we grant our professors and instructors as complete liberty as possible.

It will be noted that both President Hurie and Dean Countiss testify to Dr. Harris' loyalty and cooperation.

It is pertinent to note Dean Mowat G. Fraser's estimate of Dr. Harris' worth to Winthrop College. In the fall of 1940 he wrote the following letter to several teachers' agencies, and gave a copy to Dr. Harris. The letter reads as follows:

Miss Elizabeth Lee Harris is one of our ablest faculty members. She is one of those select few among college teachers who are excellent and original in scholarship, industrious and conscientious to a fault, and in love with teaching. She appeals highly to our best students as well as to all others. Furthermore, Miss Harris is pleasing in personality and appearance, has a keen sense of humor, cooperates to the limit, and has an all-round culture—

notably in music, for she is an accomplished organist. I hope we are able to hold her here indefinitely.

If there is any further information which I can supply you, I shall be glad to send it.

If there were any shortcomings of Dr. Harris which were significant, they should have been brought directly to her attention long before the end of her fourth year as a member of the faculty of Winthrop College rather than belatedly as an unofficially avowed justification of a *fait accompli*. Furthermore, under no circumstances could they justify Dr. Harris' dismissal without adequate notice and without a hearing. The Committee finds that the dismissal of Dr. Harris was unjustifiable according to all principles of reputable academic practice.¹

V

Although the details in the cases of Drs. Macdonald and Harris provide a sufficient commentary on general tenure conditions and faculty-administration relations at Winthrop College, additional data are available. The dismissals investigated were only two out of several during recent years which have caused great disquietude among the members of the faculty.

The Committee can testify from its own experience that the situation at Winthrop College is tense. From several sources within the faculty came expressions of doubt that anyone would be bold enough to talk to the Committee when it arrived. This prediction was not entirely accurate, but it led the Committee to send a questionnaire to the members of the faculty before its visit to Rock Hill. Many of the replies to the questionnaire were brought to the Committee at night. Only a small proportion of the replies was transmitted by mail. Faculty members expressed distrust of the College post office. Some indicated that they had not submitted their answers previously lest they be made available to the College authorities. A few recent appointees professed ignorance of conditions of tenure at the College. Otherwise,

¹Dr. Harris became a member of the faculty of Southern Illinois Normal University in September, 1941.

only a small minority testified that they thought that tenure at the College was reasonably safe. The great majority testified that they felt no assurance that academic tenure was respected by the administration. Two members of the faculty who answered the questionnaire stated that they fully expected to be dismissed at the end of the year. One of these declined to be interviewed because he said he didn't want to be "fired" *before* the end of the year. Others declined to be interviewed because they thought it dangerous, and a considerable proportion stated that they thought themselves endangered even by answering the questionnaire. One teacher told the Committee that unless the present investigation produced decisive results his own position would be completely lost. Another teacher, characterized by other members of the faculty as well fitted to comment fairly on the issues involved in the investigation, refused to meet with the Committee because of the risk. Except for those who spoke favorably of the administration, practically all witnesses seemed to prefer not to be seen by other witnesses. Many witnesses were nervous and frightened in their manner of testifying and highly emotional in their attitude toward the issues under discussion.

Dr. Keith was one of the few who testified that there was no real basis for the feeling of disquietude on the part of the faculty. He told the Committee that this whole situation was "mostly talk—a lot of women getting together, talking all the time, and exaggerating." This still leaves unexplained why they talked and what they talked about—the answer being in both cases the precarious state of academic tenure at Winthrop College. Moreover, the evidence indicates that men talked, too, on the same subjects and in the same vein.

The unrest among the faculty communicated itself to the alumnae at least two years ago. The Committee has sought to interview no alumnae and no students, except in two or three cases by correspondence in reference to specific points in which they were cited by others as competent witnesses, but some of the alumnae have communicated with the Committee in reference to the situation. The Committee has refrained from advising them for the reason that by doing so it would exceed its functions which are primarily fact-finding and might seem to confirm the

charge which has been made and circulated by some persons connected with Winthrop College that the American Association of University Professors seeks to interfere in local affairs. Before the Investigating Committee was appointed, however, the alumnae had already presented a petition to the Legislature of South Carolina requesting that they be permitted to nominate two members of the Board of Trustees of the College. Since the Committee's visit to Rock Hill there have been several meetings of the Alumnae Association in reference to faculty-administration relations at the College. The Alumnae Association has requested the Board of Trustees to review the cases of Drs. Macdonald and Harris.

The students of Winthrop College have not been unaffected by the administrative behavior and tendencies described in this report. To the extent that this situation has affected teaching and research adversely, every student has been injured. There is other evidence in reference to student welfare which should be noted. In the spring of 1941 the administration of the College imposed a grade curve. President Phelps is reported as having stated that this curve was necessary in order to reduce the number of student failures, particularly in the freshman and sophomore years. He is quoted as having told the faculty that student failures represented losses which no business firm would tolerate. Three or four members of the faculty testified that administrative officers had previously requested them to raise grades in order that certain students might graduate or acquire credits to be transferred to other institutions. A teacher who states that his resignation had been forced by Dr. Keith testified that Dr. Keith had imposed constant pressure on him in the matter of student grades. One or two teachers admitted raising grades under administrative pressure. Such administrative pressure continued after the establishment of the grade curve. The English Department whose grades did not fit the curve was ordered to raise its grades but refused to do so. Some of the students became alarmed about the situation and a delegation of them interviewed President Phelps about the grade curve and its meaning. Shortly thereafter the curve was abandoned.

In the fall of 1941 when the dismissals of Drs. Macdonald and Harris became known, student unrest increased. Both of these

teachers received numerous letters from students expressing the belief that their dismissals were unjust. During the summer Dr. Harris wrote to one of her former students explaining that she had not resigned, as she supposed her students would be permitted to believe, but had been dismissed. This letter, and possibly two later ones, were shown to other students in the fall. Someone made a surreptitious copy and gave it either to President Phelps or to the Dean of Women. The student to whom the letter was addressed was summoned by President Phelps, questioned as to possible faculty involvement in her actions and given an option of making a public apology or being expelled. Upon the advice of her parents to "do what she thought was right," she refused to apologize. President Phelps, on his return after an absence from the College, dismissed the matter with the statement that both sides had made a mistake.

While the matter of this student's expulsion was in abeyance, the junior and senior classes were in a state almost of insurrection. President Phelps was said to have threatened to expel the whole junior class, and the whole junior class was said to be threatening to leave. A cartoon of President Phelps as Hitler was exhibited in a public place. Some time afterwards, following an alumnae meeting in December, 1941 to consider the troubles at Winthrop College, a group of five students wrote a letter to a journalist commending him for this exposure of "injustice" and protesting that, although Winthrop College was a good institution, it was being unjustly administered.

Most of these events occurred before the Committee's visit to Rock Hill. As already indicated, the Committee refrained from interviewing students, but, having received reports from many of the witnesses interviewed, it believes the foregoing account to be substantially correct. Apologists for Dr. Harris' dismissal accuse her of deliberately stirring up the students and seek to justify her dismissal on this ground. The Committee considers that this episode has no relevancy to an event which preceded it by several months, but because it has been challenged to read Dr. Harris' letters to the student referred to above, it has done so, and it hereby reports that, although they contain some expressions of indignation, they also advise the recipient not to worry or to become em-

bittered and to do nothing that will endanger her scholarship. There is perhaps some room for difference of opinion as to the propriety of writing these letters, but, if so, the decision in no way affects the justice or the injustice of Dr. Harris' dismissal. Nevertheless, the Committee expresses the opinion that, under the circumstances, Dr. Harris could scarcely be expected to exercise greater solicitude for the feelings of those who had unjustly dismissed her, and had thereby jeopardized her professional future, than for her own professional and personal reputation among her former students.

The Committee believes from all the evidence in this case that the general situation as regards faculty-administration relations and academic tenure at Winthrop College is in almost every respect deplorable, that reasonable security of tenure does not exist and is scarcely even understood by the governing authorities or by the faculty. The Committee believes that relations between the administration, the Trustees, and department heads on the one hand and the faculty, the students, and the alumnae on the other are wholly undesirable and are steadily growing worse.

The situation as it has developed at Winthrop College is almost inevitable in the absence of recognized standards governing academic tenure and faculty-administration relations. A teacher's awareness that he may be dismissed at any time without a hearing has a profound effect on his professional behavior. He may resolve to say or do nothing on any occasion that would tend to draw attention to himself. He may attempt to escape risk by becoming too small to be noticed or he may seek to ally himself with those who are strong enough to protect him and may use this alliance either for his own protection or for the oppression of others. Nonentities, sycophants, petty tyrants, and intriguers are the products of such an environment. Teachers find frankness and even honesty difficult when their professional reputations and means of support are subject to arbitrary annihilation. Unless individual members of a faculty can function with self-respect, the institution of which they are a part is endangered from the start. One basis for self-respect is found in reasonable provisions for tenure security. These do not prevail at Winthrop College.

It is also essential to the welfare of an educational institution that the faculty should have self-respect as a faculty. At a well-administered college or university the faculty has powers definitely provided in the charter. These powers are generally exercised either in full faculty meetings or by committees responsible to the general faculty. In some institutions the faculty may hold its power subject to presidential veto, but, even so, it at least functions as a responsible collective body of professionally experienced persons. It can state its opinions as its opinions and preserve educational honesty even if its actions are vetoed. Futile as any single faculty meeting may sometimes appear, such meetings are nevertheless indispensable safeguards against autocratic educational administration. The wise college or university president will seek the counsel of the faculty. The evidence in the present situation at Winthrop College makes it clear that President Phelps and his administrative advisers have not sought faculty opinion in the determination of policy for the College. His administration has been characterized by dictatorial attitudes and autocratic methods.

It is to be hoped that the Board of Trustees of Winthrop College will concern itself with the situation described in this report.

WILLIAM M. HEPBURN

NEWMAN I. WHITE, *Chairman*

Approved for publication by Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

E. C. KIRKLAND, *Chairman*

The personnel of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure is as follows: William E. Britton, University of Illinois; Elliott E. Cheatham, Columbia University; A. C. Cole, Western Reserve University; Thomas D. Cope, University of Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Green, Jr., *Associate Secretary*; William M. Hepburn, University of Alabama; Ralph E. Himstead, *General Secretary*; W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia; A. M. Kidd, University of California; E. C. Kirkland, Bowdoin College, *Chairman*; H. C. Lancaster, Johns Hopkins University; W. T. Laprade, Duke University; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins University; J. M. Maguire, Harvard

University; S. A. Mitchell, University of Virginia; F. M. Padel-
ford, University of Washington; DR Scott, University of Missouri;
John Q. Stewart, Princeton University; R. C. Tolman, California
Institute of Technology; Laura A. White, University of Wyoming;
and Quincy Wright, University of Chicago.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

At the third session of the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors held in Chicago, Illinois, on December 28, 1941, there was a symposium on the subject of Social Security Coverage for Colleges and Universities. Mr. John B. St. John, Chief of the Actuarial Section of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Board, and Mr. Rainard B. Robbins, Vice-President of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, presented the following papers.

By JOHN B. ST. JOHN¹

Social security is a group of governmental methods or institutions through which we take care of those individuals who suffer from the absence or loss of income by reason of such hazards as death, unemployment in old age, disability, and temporary unemployment. These institutions include such programs as Federal old-age and survivors insurance, public assistance for the aged, dependent children and the blind, unemployment compensation, work relief, and general relief. The Social Security Act established unemployment compensation and the old-age and survivors insurance system and provided for Federal participation in the financing of public assistance.

Public assistance including old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind is now available to college and university professors and their families who may fall in these categories of need, as they are available to all others in our society. These programs operate under State laws with Federal grants-in-aid and under administrative standards prescribed by the Social Security Act. They provide monthly income for needy individuals

¹ The opinions expressed are the author's, and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Social Security Board.

in accordance with their individual needs. These programs are characterized by local administration, payment of benefits only to needy persons and payment of amounts governed by the individual's need.

College and university professors, as employees of nonprofit educational institutions or of state and local governmental agencies, are excluded from the coverage and benefits of the unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance programs.

Unemployment compensation programs operate also under State laws. The Social Security Act levies a tax on employers of eight or more employees in manufacturing and commerce. If the State in which the employer operates has an unemployment compensation program under which the employer must pay a tax, the amount of tax paid to the State system is deductible from the Federal tax liability up to 90% of the Federal tax. Weekly benefits are payable for 13 to 16 weeks, after a waiting period, to qualified workers who become unemployed. The amount of weekly benefit is related directly to the previous earnings of the unemployed worker.

Unemployment compensation benefit systems are particularly adapted to the protection of industrial wage workers against unexpected layoff or discharge. The professional employees of institutions of higher education commonly work under contracts of nine months' to a year's duration. Most terminations of such employment occur at the end of a school year. Frequently there might be some doubt as to whether an individual who leaves one position at the end of a school year is unemployed or not until several months later at the beginning of the next year. Thus, in order to furnish suitable protection for college teachers, some special variation of the usual provisions would probably be required to meet their peculiar employment arrangements.

Of the three major programs established by the Social Security Act, the assistance programs and the unemployment compensation programs are administered by State agencies. The old-age and survivors insurance system is operated entirely by the Federal Government through the agency of the Social Security Board and its Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

The Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program

Old-age and survivors insurance is a system established to replace with cash payments a part of the loss of family income caused by unemployment in old age or by the death of the family breadwinner. Benefit payments to replace the loss of income are determined by a formula which strikes a balance between the provision of benefits proportional to the rate of contribution paid and the provision of benefits adequate for subsistence. The program is financed by compulsory employee and employer contributions based on the earnings of the employee. Within this complex structure the operation of the entire program must be kept as simple as possible.

As in any other insurance system, the eligibility for benefits is primarily based on the occurrence of a financial loss to beneficiaries. In the present social system most individuals are dependent upon earnings from current employment for their support. Housewives and minor children are dependent upon the earnings of the breadwinner of the family. When this income is cut off by loss of employment in old age, or by the death of the breadwinner, it almost invariably causes serious hardship. Frequently this hardship cannot be foreseen or provided for adequately by the individual wage earner in advance. This insurance system, therefore, provides the means of replacing a part of the lost income of the wage earner by payments to him and to the members of his family who are dependent upon the earned income.

Two major hazards, the occurrence of which give rise to this loss of income, are now covered by old-age and survivors insurance. These are the loss of employment in old age and death. Although the system is frequently spoken of as providing benefits on account of old age as such, it in effect provides such benefits only upon loss of employment in old age. Lack of employment may be the result of discharge, physical disability or voluntary retirement. It would be quite possible to provide a system which would pay benefits to all individuals over age 65 without regard to whether they had employment. Such a system would, however, be much more costly. Moreover, the benefits are not usually needed by the individual until his income is actually terminated by the loss of employment.

About one-third of all those who start working in their twenties will die before reaching age 65. The Social Security Act of 1935 provided a lump-sum payment at the death of a worker in an amount directly proportional to his contributions to the insurance system. When a deceased worker leaves behind a widow and children, and possibly other dependents who relied upon his income for their support, these dependents suffer a loss of income, which would not be adequately replaced by a lump-sum payment. The Act now provides monthly income benefits more adapted to meet their needs.

The loss of income resulting from retirement or death of the wage earner is frequently preceded by a more or less prolonged period of loss of employment and loss of income because of the disability of the wage earner. This period during which the earned income has been lost is not now protected by the system though it might well be and frequently is in foreign social insurance systems.

In order that the benefits provided by the system may be effective it is essential that for at least the major proportion of the beneficiaries the amount of benefit paid should be adequate to meet minimum subsistence requirements. A multitude of factors determines the number of dollars required to provide minimum subsistence. Not all these factors are known but they certainly include the number of dependent beneficiaries in the family, the part of the country in which they live, whether they live in rural or urban communities, and the standard of living to which they have become accustomed.

As far as practicable, all these factors are taken into account in the determination of benefits. Benefits are related to the number of dependent persons in the family. Benefits are also related to the level of wages earned by the wage earner and the number of years that contributions have been paid. For the present, the level of wages earned prior to retirement or death seems to be the best available measure of the factors of geographical residence, rural or urban residence, and the customary standards of living of the beneficiaries.

The insurance system is financed by compulsory contributions from the employer and the employee. The Act provides for a

gradual step-up in the contribution rate from the present 1% from the employer and 1% from the employee to 3% from each in 1949. It is recognized that ultimately the maximum contributions of 3% from each may not be adequate to support the present benefit provisions. In that case, either a contribution from general Federal revenues or higher contributions from employees and employers may be expected. The contributions are a percentage of the first \$3000 of each year's wages, which form the basis for determining the amount of benefits payable. Hence, the benefit payments and contributions with respect to each wage earner are indirectly related. The sharing of the cost by the employer is a material factor in making the benefits attractive to the individual employee.

Throughout the system the standard of simplicity of operation has determined many specific provisions of the plan at some sacrifice of individual equity between members of the system and of adequacy in meeting the needs of the individual beneficiaries. Thus, the benefit formula, although apparently rather complicated, serves as a rough practical method of determining the extent of loss and the amount of benefits which would be adequate to meet the requirements of the beneficiaries or would be a fair return for the workers' contributions. The eligibility requirements serve to determine by a rather rough and ready rule those individuals who have suffered a loss of earned income or support from such income and, hence, should be entitled to benefits.

Such provisions directed at securing simplicity of administration obviously lack sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of every individual situation. The public assistance system and other measures of social security are required as a supplement to old-age and survivors insurance to meet all individual needs.

Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Benefits

The terms of the old-age and survivors insurance system are found in Title II of the Social Security Act, which specifies the benefits payable and the conditions of payment, and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act which assesses the contributions.

Eight types of benefits are now being paid under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Primary insurance benefits are payable to each insured worker who has reached age 65 and is not earning wages of as much as \$15 per month from employment covered by the insurance system. A wife's insurance benefit of 50% of the primary benefit is payable to the wife of any insured person who is receiving benefits if the wife is also at least 65 years old. A child's insurance benefit of 50% of the primary benefit is payable to an unmarried child under the age of 18 of a person receiving primary benefits.

Primary benefits for the retired worker alone now range from \$10 to \$42 a month, according to the worker's previous earnings. The average benefit payable is about \$23. A retired worker and his wife also over 65, or a retired worker and a child, may currently receive from \$15 to \$63 a month. The present average benefit for such families is about \$37 a month.

A widow's insurance benefit of 75% of the primary benefit is payable to the widow of an insured man if she is 65 or over as long as she does not remarry. This benefit is payable whether the worker dies before age 65 or after. Such benefits range from \$10 to over \$30 per month. The present average benefit is about \$20.

A young widow's benefit of 75% of the primary benefit is payable to the widow of an insured worker who has in her care a child or children of the worker under the age of 18. A child's insurance benefit of 50% of the primary benefit is payable to each surviving unmarried child under the age of 18, until the maximum family benefit is reached. These benefits for the surviving family of an insured worker may range from \$10 for a single child to as high as \$85 per month for a family of four, according to the number in the family and the worker's previous earnings. Present average benefits are about \$34 for a widow and one child, \$47 for a widow and two children, and \$51 for a widow and three or more children.

A parent's insurance benefit of 50% of the primary benefit is payable to either or both parents of an insured individual who died and left no widow or minor child. The benefit is payable if the parent was wholly dependent upon and supported by the deceased worker at the time of his death. Benefits commence at age

65. These benefits now range from \$10 to \$21 for each individual and average about \$13 a month.

Lump-sum death payments are payable at the death of any insured worker who leaves no surviving widow, child or parent eligible for monthly benefits. Lump-sum payments range from \$60 to \$250 and average about \$145.

Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Provisions

(The following selected provisions are described briefly with omission of minor conditions. A more complete description may be found in Social Security Board pamphlets entitled, "For Workers and Their Families," and "How to Calculate Benefits under Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.")

For a wage earner or his dependents to be eligible for benefits, the wage earner must have been either fully or currently insured at retirement or death. A fully insured worker is one who has received wages of at least \$50 in each of one-half the calendar quarters since January 1, 1937, or since he reached age 21. He must have received wages of \$50 in at least 6 quarters and if the number of quarters with \$50 or more of wages is 40 or more it need not be equal to one-half the quarters elapsed. A currently insured worker is one who has received at least \$50 in wages for at least 6 of the 12 quarters immediately preceding the quarter of his death. A worker who is currently insured but not fully insured is not eligible for retirement benefits. His widow is eligible for benefits only if she has a child of the worker in her care.

The application of the formula to determine the amount payable to any beneficiaries involves several stages. After it has been established that the worker or his dependents are entitled to benefits, the wage earner's average monthly wage is determined. This is his total earnings while under the program divided by the total number of months elapsed since January 1, 1937. The basic benefit is then 40% of the first \$50 of the average monthly wage plus 10% of the excess over \$50 up to the maximum of \$250 average monthly wage. To this basic benefit is added 1% of the basic benefit for each year in which the wage earner received \$200 or more in wages. The result is called the primary benefit and is the amount which would be paid to a worker on retirement.

The dependents benefits for wife, widow, child or parent are percentages of the primary benefit. The final benefits thus computed may be modified by the maximum and minimum provisions. Total benefits payable to one family may not exceed (a) 80% of the average monthly wage, (b) two times the primary benefit or (c) \$85, whichever of these is the least. This places an effective maximum on the number of beneficiaries who may draw benefits in a large family. If the wage earner is living, only two others in the family may receive benefits. If the wage earner is dead, only four survivors may receive benefits. A minimum of \$10 a month is allowed for a single beneficiary.

The retirement benefit is payable only to a worker who is not working substantially in a covered job. This does not prevent the retired worker from returning to work or working casually. If such work is in covered employment, however, and the earnings in any month exceed \$14.99, the benefit is not payable for that month. A wife's and child's benefits are also suspended if the beneficiary returns to work. Any dependents benefits are suspended if the beneficiary earns more than \$14.99 in covered employment in any month.

All benefits terminate at the beneficiary's death. The wife's benefit terminates at her husband's death and may be replaced by a widow's benefit. A widow's benefit terminates upon the remarriage of the widow. Children's benefit terminates when they reach age 18 or upon marriage and are suspended if they do not attend school when feasible between 16 and 18. The young widow's benefit terminates at remarriage or when the youngest child reaches 18 but may commence again at age 65 if she has not remarried and the worker was fully insured.

Need for Supplementation

The level of benefits provided by the old-age and survivors insurance formula is not acceptable to many individuals and institutions as an adequate retirement income, particularly for members of professional and administrative staffs. Accordingly many organizations have supplementary retirement plans which serve to accomplish objectives not fully met by the Federal insurance program.

Staff retirement plans have commonly provided for a retirement income of about 50% of the average salary of the individual. More recent plans have tended to relate the income to both average salary and length of service but still produce an income of about 50% of salary for employees who have spent a normal working lifetime with the organization.

Old-age and survivors insurance, on the other hand, provides much smaller benefits in relation to earnings. For the individual whose average earnings were \$100 a month, present benefits are about 26% of his earnings if he is single or 39% for himself and his wife together. After 20 years in the Federal system such an individual would receive about 30% if single or 45% for man and wife. For the professional man whose earnings were \$250 a month or more, present benefits would be about 17% if single and 25% for man and wife. After 25 years in the Federal system such an individual would receive only about 20% if single and 30% for man and wife.

From these figures it can be seen that a supplementary retirement plan or individual insurance program can well provide substantial additional retirement income particularly for the higher salaried staff without exceeding the commonly accepted standards for adequate retirement income. Supplementary plan benefits could be more directly related to salary and years of service if that were considered desirable. Some plans have even arranged to offset in part the relatively more favorable benefits provided by the Federal system for lower paid individuals.

The Federal system makes no provision for superannuation prior to age 65. A supplementary staff plan or individual insurance may provide income for retirement before age 65. This would normally be a temporarily larger income before age 65, a part of which would be replaced by the amount of the Federal benefit commencing at that age. The individual could then count on receiving about the same fixed income each year.

Many individuals who already have the benefit of a staff retirement plan in operation are undoubtedly concerned about what would be the effect on these plans if they were brought under the old-age and survivors insurance program. This problem is essentially the same as that faced by industrial and commercial organi-

zations in 1937 when the Federal insurance program became effective. Most of these plans have been made supplementary plans without loss to the employees covered and many have resulted in substantial gains to employees. The employing institutions have been put to some inconvenience in readjusting their plans but are undoubtedly repaid by having more effective protection for their employees.

The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association insures a substantial number of the existing plans for university staffs. That association indicated in its Twentieth Annual Report its willingness to adjust existing plans. The report also suggests the steps that would require consideration in making such adjustments. All institutions with existing plans that face the problem of possible adjustment have the advantage of a large body of industrial and commercial experience in adjustment of different types of plans to draw upon for guidance.

Legislative History

The Social Security Act of 1935 excluded most employees of institutions of higher education under one or the other of two classes of employment. Public institutions were excluded as employment for a State or political agency. Private institutions were excluded as employment with a nonprofit religious or educational organization. These exclusions were essentially unchanged by the 1939 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Since 1939 a number of bills has been introduced in Congress containing proposals for extending the Federal insurance coverage to employment in public and private educational institutions.

Complete compulsory coverage would be extended to all State and local governmental employment by the Lesinski bill (H.R. 1092) introduced in the present Congress. This bill would cover the staff of colleges under the control of State or local government agencies.

A bill introduced in the present Congress by Senator Walsh (S. 670) would cover nonprofit employment except for ordained ministers and members of religious orders in the performance of the regular duties of their calling. This would, of course, cover the

staff of all private institutions although there may be some doubt as to whether it would include teaching staff members who are ordained ministers.

Coverage by voluntary compacts made between the States or other political units and the Social Security Board would be authorized by a bill introduced in the present Congress by Representative Healey (H.R. 4882). This bill would specifically exclude from such possible coverage individuals who are members of an existing public retirement plan. So far no proposal for the coverage of nonprofit employment through voluntary compacts has been introduced in Congress.

A recent bill introduced by Senator Johnson of Colorado (S. 1952) would permit states or other governmental units to elect coverage of their teachers and other public school employees by paying the appropriate contributions and filing informational returns.

Advantages of Federal Insurance

Of 1700 institutions of higher education in the United States about 580, or one-third, have formal retirement plans for their academic staff. Probably many more have informal pension plans. This very creditable showing indicates a high degree of appreciation of the importance of provisions for retirement. On the other hand, it is estimated that upwards of 25% of the academic staff of those institutions which have retirement plans are not members of these plans, in large measure because of their voluntary character. It is also probable that a substantial proportion of all institutions make no systematic provision for the retirement of their academic staff members. Few institutions have any retirement plan for the large body of nonacademic employees. The Federal insurance system could provide some retirement protection for all employees.

Insurance protection for the surviving widows and children of employees of educational institutions has for the most part been left to the initiative of the individual. As a consequence, many families are without adequate insurance protection, sometimes

because the physical condition of the employee makes it impossible for him to buy insurance, sometimes because the larger the family responsibilities, the more difficult it becomes for the individual to buy his own insurance protection. The Federal insurance system, by determining benefits on the family basis, provides substantial survivors insurance at a cost to the individual employee which cannot be matched under any other form of insurance.

Academic circles have long been familiar with the type of annuity issued by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association which permits the individual to carry his protection with him upon transfer to another institution. A similar provision is a major feature of the Federal insurance system, but its operation is confined to those employments which are a part of the system. If educational institutions were covered under the Federal system, it would then be possible for any new employee, academic or nonacademic, to enter the employ of an institution without losing insurance protection which he had established in a commercial employment. Similarly, an individual could transfer between universities or he could leave an educational institution to enter trade or industry without having to serve an initial qualifying period to obtain Federal insurance protection.

In summary, the advantages to college and university professors of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance are: First, it would provide some old-age protection for all teaching staffs. At present a substantial portion of the professional staffs and most of the nonacademic employees have no retirement protection. Second, it would provide survivorship protection for all. At present, even those who are covered by retirement systems do not in general have survivorship protection comparable to that provided under old-age and survivors insurance. The Federal system provides more adequate insurance protection than most families are able to provide for themselves. Third, it would provide a continuity of basic protection. An employee transferring from one institution to another, or from educational employment into another type of work, would carry with him the credits he had accumulated under the Federal system. He would not have to begin all over again to build up retirement protection or to qualify for survivorship insurance.

By RAINARD B. ROBBINS

Mr. St. John has described our social insurances consisting of a plan for unemployment compensation under which the Federal government requires a 3% tax of employers, except as this is modified by experience rating, and the states determine and pay the benefits; and a national, compulsory, contributory plan for old-age and survivors benefits supported by joint contributions of employer and employees. Participation in both these plans is required of employments that are not explicitly excepted. Among those excepted are employment for nonprofit-making institutions and public employment.

As I understand it, practically all of you are employed by nonprofit-making institutions or by so-called public employers, and I can imagine that you are asking whether the exceptions just mentioned should be removed in whole or in part, what the prospects are that they will be removed whether you like it or not, and what the effect would be on insurance and annuity plans in which many of you now participate if these exceptions were removed.

Taking the second question first, I believe that the preparedness program alone has delayed recommendations to Congress from the administration for amendment of the social security legislation. As to what those recommendations might be, if you have noticed the news items on this subject in the *New York Times* for October 1 and October 5 you have about all that I can tell you. The Social Security Board is assigned the task of administering these social insurance plans as they are and of recommending changes and extensions that may be suggested by its experience in this administration.

Perhaps the most stubborn fact that the Board must face in its effort to do a good job is the high degree of mobility of American workers. At the end of 1939 more than 42% of those who had wage credits under the old-age and survivors insurance program had received such credit for less than half the three-year period of 1937-1939.¹ This reflects a high degree of shifting in and out of covered employment and has led the Social Security Board to the conviction that coverage should be extended to presently excluded

¹ "Insured Status under Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," Michael Wermel and Benjamin Mandel, *Social Security Bulletin*, November, 1941.

employments just as rapidly as mechanical difficulties and political opposition can be overcome. Whenever the coverage is practically complete, there will be little loss of eligibility for benefits and little loss of credit toward benefits because of shifting from one employment to another. Only unemployment could then cause a disturbance of insured status with respect to old-age and survivors provisions, and along with extensions of coverage might come provision for continuation of the insured status during unemployment.

Prospect of Extension of Coverage

In his press conference on September 30, President Roosevelt indicated that recommendation might soon be made to extend the old-age and survivors insurance provisions to farm and casual labor, domestic service, public employment, self-employment, and employment for nonprofit institutions. About 27,000,000 workers are here involved, of whom 4,000,000 are public employees and only 1,000,000 are with nonprofit-making institutions. It was not clear from the President's statement whether or not extension would be sought with respect to unemployment compensation for these classes; he pointed out that this extension would require amendment of all state unemployment compensation laws. This statement and the fact that it would be very difficult to administer unemployment provisions with respect to casual labor, domestic service, and self-employment gives weight to the thought that the administration may try for very broad extension of the old-age and survivors provisions at this time, leaving for further study extensions of the unemployment benefits.

On the other hand, the Social Security Board is already on record to the effect that both coverages are needed in connection with employment for nonprofit institutions and that there is no mechanical administrative difficulty here in question. There may therefore be reason to expect a repetition of the Board's recommendation of three years ago that both the old-age and survivors insurance and the unemployment compensation programs be extended to nonprofit employment. A reason for doubting this is the determined opposition that developed three years ago when

this recommendation was made. It is conceivable that the Board might reiterate its previous recommendation but interpose no opposition if the nonprofit institutions could induce Congress to make one extension without the other. In fact the Board's lesson of three years ago may lead it to just this recommendation.

Another suggestion announced from Washington on October 5 is the nationalization of the unemployment compensation scheme and its pooling with old-age and survivors insurance so that there would no longer be separate taxes for each. The suggestion is that the taxes be revised so as to divide them equally between employer and employee, each paying, for the present, 2.5% of compensation up to \$3000 a year. This method would be confusing to those who have been thinking of the two coverages separately and considering one of them more desirable than the other. It would take some of the argument away from the nonprofit institutions because their total tax would be smaller than the present tax with respect to unemployment benefits.

But the administrator of the unemployment compensation part of such a scheme would meet the same practical difficulties in dealing with particular groups that would have to be faced if the pooling were avoided. What should be the qualifications for unemployment compensation on the part of sharecroppers, itinerant farm or casual workers, self-employed individuals, and domestic servants who work a few days here and a few days there. Pooling the coverage in one large national scheme doesn't answer such questions. Unless the Social Security Board has at least tentative answers it will probably not recommend extension of coverage that would require that the questions be faced.

When we turn to public employment, the difficulties are constitutional and political. It is not now clear that the Federal government could force a tax on states or their subdivisions for the purpose of supporting social insurance. Furthermore, there is evidence of stubborn resistance to extension of the old-age and survivors insurance to employments now covered by public-employee retirement plans. From the standpoint of the Social Security Board the need for the social insurance coverages is about the same for public employees as for persons doing similar work for private employers, and there is no mechanical administrative

difficulty involved with respect to most such workers. The only questions are those of constitutionality and political expediency. It is possible that in its anxiety to make headway in this field and to avoid the constitutional difficulty, the Board may yield to the suggestion which has already taken "bill" form, that states or their subdivisions decide as to the extension of coverage to their employees.

Quite independent of President Roosevelt's announcement, the Secretary of the Treasury has suggested increasing the old-age and survivors insurance taxes to the maximum contemplated in 1949, his purpose being to furnish war funds and to sop up purchasing power as a hedge against inflation. I have heard no good word for this suggestion, and it seems likely that the Social Security Board would beg that desirable methods of financing social insurance benefits should not be confused with objectives so completely foreign to them as those stated by Mr. Morgenthau. Let Congress decide if it wants to raise revenue by means of a wage tax but don't confuse this with social security financing. A weakness of this argument is that at present the taxing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code that were created to support social insurance benefits give not the least inkling that this is their purpose.

A thought independent of any of the above is that, with the United States now participating actively in the World War, there may be a keener realization than ever before of the demoralizing effects of loss of social benefit credits through changes in employment. We anticipate millions of shifts, some from and some to covered employment and millions may throw away their social security cards in despair or disgust when they enter military service. This, coupled with a desire to avoid chaos when transition to peaceful pursuits is again possible, may lead to sweeping extension of all parts of the social insurance coverage; incidentally, this might be our best safeguard against later treasury raids for military pensions of doubtful justification.

There is no excuse whatever for the exemption of Federal employment from the social security coverage. The last fair argument disappeared when Congress turned down the Clark amendment which would have exempted employment covered by retirement plans of industry. Political expediency is all that is left.

The need for the benefit provisions is surely as great as in corresponding private employment; there are no mechanical administrative difficulties; Congress has simply been unwilling to face the organized opposition of employees, presumably answerable to Congress.

To sum up this part of the discussion, it is anyone's guess what recommendations will be made to Congress, when they will be made, or what Congress may see fit to do with them. My guess is that, unless a sweeping emergency extension is made, which to me seems not unlikely, the Social Security Board will recommend extension of the whole social insurance program to employment for nonprofit institutions, but that it will not urge the unemployment coverage at this time. If it can see its way through the constitutional difficulties, I think it will do the same with respect to public employment other than employment for the Federal government.

Desirability of Coverage

Having in mind the prospect that amendment for the extension of social security legislation is likely, you may have asked yourself: Should I support or oppose such proposals in whole or in part? In other words, from my standpoint is coverage of the social security legislation desirable or undesirable?

I realize that your membership is divided between publicly and privately administered institutions and between institutions with and those without well-established plans for retirement income or benefits in case of death in harness. Among the contributory retirement plans of your institutions, some make use of contracts of life insurance companies and others are in the nature of state, municipal, or institutional plans covering public employees generally or employees of particular classes such as public school teachers. With respect to the present discussion your personal interest may, therefore, be in the possible extension of social security coverage to employment for nonprofit institutions or to public employment, or to both.

Another difference between your institutions has a bearing on the desirability of provisions for unemployment compensation. Some colleges and universities are much larger than others; some

house and feed their students while others do not; some are located in large cities while others are the sole reason for the existence of their communities. At least during the regular college year, employment for almost any college or university is probably far more steady and secure than is the case in most industrial firms. The officers of small colleges uniformly claim that their institutions give rise to practically no unemployment other than regular, predetermined vacation periods. Larger institutions are more vulnerable in this regard, especially if they have dormitories and if they are located in large cities. But even here we note that professional employees are employed on a contractual basis for periods of at least a year; rules of tenure practically eliminate the possibility of dismissal for large groups; and maintenance employees have far greater assurance of steady work than have persons doing similar work in industry. In fact, while there are admirable and encouraging examples of steady employment in industry, highly competitive production spurred on by the profit motive often has characteristics that a socially minded employer finds very difficult to bring into line with his ideals of steady employment. Even in our largest educational institutions employment needs can be forecast far more accurately both as to number of workers and as to working periods than seems possible in industry. And when it is necessary to part with an employee there is little doubt that a long period of warning and opportunities to seek other employment on the institution's time are worth more in large numbers of cases than would be rights to unemployment compensation if this coverage were extended.

These facts are reflected in the strenuous opposition of college officers to the extension of the unemployment provisions of the social security legislation to employment for educational institutions. But it is fair to add that some officers in our large city universities realize that, with respect to maintenance employees, their institutions are in many respects similar to industrial employers drawing on the same labor markets. Their institutions are not free from causing unemployment. Furthermore, the fact must be faced that an educational institution is an employer and that suffering through the absence of social benefit coverage is experienced by individual families quite regardless of the frequency

with which suffering arises among the employees of a particular employer.

We must not forget that our educational institutions have been leaders in studies for social betterment. It would be unfortunate indeed if they took an anti-social attitude toward what seems to be the most far-reaching program of social betterment that has ever been undertaken. There is much to say for the view that an educational institution should consider participation as an employer in any social insurance scheme that it would recommend for employment in general. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that our plans for unemployment compensation are not yet crystallized. We do not agree on what to expect of such a plan. And until we have more definite objectives it is difficult to criticize nonprofit-making institutions for wishing to avoid the drain of a 3% wage tax which they are convinced would be largely a contribution on their part to the stabilization of employment in competitive industry conducted for profit.

Returning to our question of the desirability of social security extension and considering the old-age and survivors insurance program alone, there seems to be general agreement that the benefits are of a desirable nature and not excessive. Except for the unusual person who receives compensation of as much as \$3000 a year for most of his working years and remains a bachelor, these benefits are furnished for less in the way of wage-taxes than would be necessary as premiums if purchase were made from an insurance carrier. No one knows what the future holds in store in the evolution of the social benefit program in this country; but, judging from the experience of other countries, it seems likely that, whatever may be the modification of benefits and taxes, part of the support will come from general taxation; in other words, the wage taxes paid by employers and employees will probably leave a considerable load to be covered by contributions from the government. If this appraisal is correct, it explains the gradual fading of opposition to the extension of old-age and survivors insurance provisions where only economy and budgetary considerations are involved. In fact, many institutions are anxious to see this extension come about. It would just about solve the problem of social benefits for most of the maintenance employees and, in recent years, this

problem has become embarrassing at many institutions. For institutions that have not as yet established retirement plans, it would lighten the load of benefits in recognition of earlier service. Almost without exception it would furnish more valuable and more appropriate survivors benefits than exist under group insurance arrangements.

But this is not the whole story. Many institutions have plans for retirement income, funded through retirement annuity contracts, with benefits far beyond the maximum payable under the social security plan. These contracts are much more flexible than are the social security provisions. The retirement benefit may be made available whenever desired; form of settlement may be chosen at retirement in the light of the composition of the family; the amount of benefit is calculated actuarially and can be controlled by the contract holder through premium payments. Since contracts are involved, their provisions must be fulfilled if the insurance carrier remains solvent.

Many individuals prefer such a plan to dealing with the government; some are concerned over the fact that the Federal plan can be changed at will by Congress even to the disadvantage of participants. The importance of this fact must, of course, remain a matter of personal opinion. But the amount of shifting in employment from educational institutions to industry and *vice versa* is large, and breaks in social insurance coverage due to these shifts are a very serious matter from a social standpoint. Few workers today realize the value of the survivors benefits that they sacrifice when they go from industry to college employment. But the employing officer of the college should understand this and, if he does, he can hardly be silent unless the college is ready to duplicate these benefits in case of death of the worker after he joins the college staff.

To make this concrete, let me refer you to examples shown in the report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities of the Association of American Colleges, reprinted on pages 352-357 of your June, 1941 *Bulletin*. I shall give a single example here: A man now age 30 with a wife and three children has had steady employment in industry since 1937 at \$100 a month. If he should die now his widow would receive for herself and her children \$52.50

a month until the eldest child reached age 16 or 18 if in school; then the benefit would decrease somewhat, but until the youngest child reached age 16 or 18 if in school the benefit would be at least \$32.81 a month. After the youngest child reached age 18, benefit payments would be suspended entirely, to be resumed at \$19.69 a month when the widow reached age 65. Of course this is independent of the provision for a substantial retirement benefit available to the worker when he reaches age 65, supplemented by half as much for his wife when she reaches age 65.

If this worker is induced to leave industry for college employment with the social security law as it is today the possible benefit to survivors disappears entirely after 18 months. In case of death when the eldest of the three children is age 6, these benefits are equivalent to considerably more than \$6000 of life insurance. Unfortunately the worker doesn't realize this and no college or university has a corresponding coverage for workers of this class.

I come now to a related question which may be in some of your minds: Why not extend social security coverage to maintenance employees of educational institutions and allow academic workers to develop or continue their own life insurance and annuity plans? Or, why not extend coverage to those not now covered by substantial plans for retirement income or benefits in case of death in service? Why disturb various benefit plans already operating especially when these plans promise much larger benefits than can ever be available under the Federal plan?

These questions are natural enough and, as you may guess, they sprang immediately to the minds of employers with such plans in operation when the original legislation was being considered. Church pension funds were joined by the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. in suggesting amendment exempting their coverage. Prominent industrial employers united in pushing the so-called Clark amendment after the Social Security Act was adopted, for the purpose of exempting employment covered by private plans. But it is to the credit of personnel officers in industry and to government representatives who had the task of suggesting legislation that nothing of the sort became effective.

After detailed scrutiny of the problems that this method would introduce, industrial employers with well-funded, well-constructed

plans for retirement income were ready to forego the advantages of maintaining their private plans unchanged. An essential difficulty is the continual shifting of large numbers from one employment to another and, in addition, there would be the extremely irritating task of passing on the initial and continuing qualifications of each individual private retirement plan that might ask exemption of its participants. Such a duty on the part of a governmental agency bristles with difficulties, both technical and political.

If this were only a pleasant history of a danger happily avoided, it would deserve little attention now. But the unfortunate fact is that today a variety of interests connected with retirement plans for public employees is uniting to make a far more stubborn stand for this point of view than any we have seen yet. These forces are well organized and perhaps no group of its size has been more successful than have public employees in influencing legislation, both state and national. They know what they want; they know their legislators; they can make a plausible argument about a matter that is too technical for the busy legislator to grasp; and there is little organized opposition. One of their suggestions is that, of public employees, only those not eligible to participate in a retirement plan for public employees be covered by the old-age and survivors insurance provisions; another is that the public employer, whether it be state, city, county, school district, or what not, decide whether or not its employees shall be covered by the Federal plan; another is that the Federal government make compacts with those states that desire to have their public employees covered by the Federal plan, with the possible complication of exceptions for those now covered by other plans.

I must not take your time now to discuss this question with any thoroughness. But you are accustomed to going to the bottom of difficult problems and I am confident that any of you will reach sound conclusions if you keep thoroughly in mind:

1. That there is bound to continue to be a wide variety of provisions in retirement plans for public employees; no one of them contains all that is in the old-age and survivors insurance plan; continuity of coverage when shifting from public employment to industry or *vice versa* will probably continue to be nonexistent;

2. That there is an immense amount of shifting from one kind of employment to another even among those now connected with colleges and universities;

3. That our social insurance is set up to cover all who are employed in other than excepted employments to the extent of the first \$3000 of annual compensation; it does not, like that of some other countries, apply only to those in lower income brackets; there is little prospect of a change on this fundamental point; this means that all or none of the employees of nonprofit institutions will be covered;

4. That plans suggesting the exercise of choice usually leave this to the employer; but even if the employee chooses, he does so for the other members of his family as well as for himself, and at the time he makes his choice he cannot foresee the circumstances under which benefits will be forthcoming; he is probably poorly equipped to make an intelligent choice and is very apt to be swayed by considerations at variance with the best interests of himself and his family;

5. That it is doubtful if any Federal agency can exercise satisfactory scrutiny to see that various public-employee plans remain worthy of approval as substitutes for the Federal plan. Individuals could probably be assured only by a guarantee that whatever might happen to the public-employee plan the government would see that the individual received benefits at least as liberal as would be available under the social security legislation.

Adjustment of Existing Plans

The question that may interest some of you most is: What effect will extension of old-age and survivors insurance to educational institutions have on presently operating plans for retirement income and survivors benefits? At present, the social security legislation ignores all such plans and I expect all amendments to do likewise. At any rate, no amendment will undertake to say what shall happen to other plans.

Most of the contributory retirement plans of privately administered colleges and universities are funded through retirement annuity contracts issued by Teachers Insurance and Annuity

Association¹ and owned by the participants. Under these contracts the whole equity runs to the participant and the benefits purchased with premiums already paid at any particular time are independent of what may happen thereafter with regard to premium payments. There will be no difficulty in adjustment of plans of this type so as to purchase in the future whatever annuity benefits may be desired to supplement expectations from the social security coverage. An immediate suggestion is that premiums paid to T. I. A. A. be decreased by the taxes required by the government for the same individuals. Some institutions realize that regular contributions will not furnish for recent entrants the retirement benefits that were contemplated years ago when the plans were inaugurated. Where finances will permit, it will be desirable to make adjustments that will favor these later participants. Another reason for their special consideration is that the Federal plan favors older persons so that any percentage reduction in institutional contributions that ignores age will accentuate the present unfavorable position of the younger participant.

Some institutions use retirement annuity contracts of other companies and a few have group annuity contracts. Adjustments in these cases may be more troublesome but will be somewhat similar to adjustments that have already been worked out in industrial retirement plans so that no insurmountable difficulties should be met.

If extension is made to public employees without special exception of employment covered by presently existing public-employee retirement plans, adjustments will not be so easy and may, in some

¹ T. I. A. A., a legal reserve life insurance company, was incorporated in the State of New York in 1918 for the pooling of the interests of colleges and universities in the funding of provision for retirement income on a contractual basis. It issues both life insurance and annuity policies. Its formation was suggested by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and it was made possible by a gift from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It has no soliciting agents but deals through the mails with staff members of colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland, any one of whom is eligible to apply for a contract. In form it is a stock corporation but its charter provides that business shall be done without profit to stockholders. It is distinctly a mutual undertaking in the interest of higher education to furnish essential services as appropriate and as economical as feasible. Policyholders have a direct representation of at least four of the possible twenty trustees, and educational institutions are represented by trustees who have been chosen because they are officers of these institutions or because of their interest in educational affairs.

cases, involve a restudy of the objectives of the plans. While some of these adjustments may be troublesome, they are, after all, transitional problems and their difficulty should not be a determining item in whether or not this social security extension is desirable. This should be decided on more fundamental grounds.

Perhaps little need be said about group life insurance plans. Invariably these involve insurance from year to year so that no loss of equity is involved in their discontinuance. Many group life insurance plans covering college staff members reflect effective salesmanship more than careful analysis of needs and their re-vamping might be of considerable social value. Plans that are not particularly burdensome for the institutions will probably be continued. While the survivors benefits of the social security program may be more valuable, they are not so impressive because provision for lump-sum payment is insignificant.

Summary

To summarize briefly what I have been saying, I have assumed your interest in the desirability of the extension of social security legislation to educational institutions, in the prospect that this extension will occur, and in the effect of any such extension on benefit plans now in operation. It seems probable that, whenever the administration at Washington can get around to it, recommendations will be made to extend the whole of the social insurance program to educational institutions, despite the fact that there are substantial difficulties in the way of this extension to public employment. The benefit provisions of the old-age and survivors insurance are intrinsically desirable for educational workers and the wage-taxes will probably always be less than the cost of the benefits. At present the plan for unemployment compensation is not attractive to educational institutions and perhaps opposition on the part of these institutions will be respected. The amendment of existing benefit plans that would be desirable if the old-age and survivors insurance program were extended to educational institutions presents no very serious problems for most of the colleges and universities and no insurmountable problems for public-

employee retirement plans. If this extension is made, it will be good policy for every institution with retirement provisions to scrutinize its plan with care in the hope that, after amendment, the combination of the Federal plan and the local plan may be more valuable than is the local plan at present.

VITAMINS FOR THE VETERAN TEACHER¹

By LAURENS H. SEELYE

Institute of International Education

Alert administrators are eager presumably to obtain able teachers and, if possible, superior teachers. Yet after the teacher is employed, has weathered probation, and has settled into a cozy teaching nest, busy administrators have given little effective thought to what befalls his teaching mind in the grind of ensuing years. What may happen to this snugly ensconced teacher's outlook over the first decade, the second decade, perhaps over a third or fourth decade? It is this: the maturing complacency of a teaching mind—a mind which once gave promise of vitality but steadily over the decades has lost enthusiasm for the adventure of teaching. Not often is this redemptively noted. Perhaps fortunately, it is not widely advertised.

Among educators responsible for developing the sense of educational mission in their colleges one may hear questions like: How can teacher X's shell be cracked so he will come to enjoy interplay of ideas with other teachers? How can we get teacher Y to take a fair view of the new type of examinations? How can we show teacher U that although he tried the plan before and it did not seem to work, circumstances have changed and a new trial is desirable? Will teacher Z ever outgrow his uncriticized graduate-school pattern? How can we get teacher V interested in the improvement of his lectures? . . . When educators forgather, those are some of the questions which the little birdies overhear.

Sometimes complacency is bred in the veteran by repetition of the same courses one, two, three decades, giving up hope of invitation to a college with higher prestige and salary, and basking in the honor of a third or fourth re-election to office in his town's local service club or country club. When these happen, this teacher has become a respect-worthy veteran of the province

¹ Reprinted from *The Journal of Higher Education*, November, 1941, Vol. XII, No. 8.

wherein he dwells. His soul can purr in comfort, appreciated by local citizens.

In his defense it must be said that college administrative officers probably furnished him year after year with a mass of "dumb-headed students," rarely a youth of talent. Year after year he has shot his subject material at them, cajoled, maneuvered, and blitzkrieged; so he has grown fatigued and cynical. Little wonder, then, that his body and mind ensconced themselves cozily into his nook. His nest is feathered, somewhat meagerly perhaps, with monthly pay-checks. His pillbox is armed with a mortar that shoots examination questions into the trenches of his opponents, with an occasional hand grenade in the form of unexpected slip tests. He is veteran of many civil wars on the faculty and undergraduate front. With plenty of academic freedom there is a shrinking paucity of educational imagination to make creative use of the freedom!

By the end of his second decade of instruction he will be a rare bird if the anodyne of pedantry has not numbed the movement of his mind. Yet if he has become a pedant, he will never know it. His community will protect him from that distressing knowledge. For, after a couple of decades of service to business, church, and politics in his home town he has acquired such local prestige that no one would think of mentioning to him a little foible like pedantry. Also, there are alumni who enjoy nostalgic memory of the way he hung his spectacles from one ear, or whistled when clearing his throat, or bellowed "Tosh! Tosh!" Their affectionate dictum on him is, "Of course I never learned much from Old Tosh Tosh, but he is a good sort. Never harmed anyone, and a lot of fun. I want my son to sit under him."

II

Let us now assume effective thought and action by a college administration (including trustees and alumni!) who are concerned with this problem. There will be a policy and plan which not only secures able teachers but actively tries to help them grow with the decades in both the profession and the art of teaching. In such a college there will be definite and fruitful emphasis to further the

"professional development" of its teachers. Currently the conventional minimum of this aid furnishes the teacher with departmental, library, or laboratory appropriations. These are about the limit of what the college does to help the instructor improve his teaching. More than this is needed, directed toward the growth of the teacher himself and the broadening of his horizon. Wealthy colleges provide "sabbatical leaves" every seven years with full or part salaries, but that policy is too expensive for most of our hundreds of small American colleges.

There are many inexpensive ways, however, to further the personal development of teachers before complacency cushions the veteran. One common aid is subventions to help teachers attend meetings of their professional associations. Others, less used but readily available, are: leaves of absence during which the teacher on leave receives the difference between his salary and that of a substitute; exchanges with teachers from other schools and colleges for a week, a semester, or a year, particularly with institutions in other regions or with a different outlook; overseas exchanges with American colleges in the Near East, India, or the Far East; visiting professors in residence for stated periods, from Europe, Latin America, Asia, or from some other institution in the U. S. A.; visits of distinguished refugee scholars; winter periods of a week or more which teachers from the small college spend at some neighboring great university among seminars, libraries, laboratories, and faculties; summer teaching appointments in unusual centers like labor schools, schools of another race, or work camps.

With but little annual expenditure from a college budget item for "professional development" or from five hundred to five thousand dollars many of the faculty may enjoy these opportunities. If a teacher of science, say, secured from this fund a small appropriation to enable him to contribute his services as teacher of English or parliamentary law in a summer labor school, his two months in that new type of teaching would bring fresh stir into his imagination. Or, if a teacher of Latin or fine arts received an appropriation to enable her to lead discussion groups in a Friends' service camp over a summer, the horizon on her specialized teaching would be broadened. Over a decade or two, a college with a similar policy of professional development for its teachers, exe-

cuted with imagination, might enjoy so many vital educational experiences and find such profitable and perhaps exciting events happening among its faculty minds that it would not need to hire fancy "publicity experts" to dig out and inflate for the world its laudable merits. Its veterans would hardly know complacency, except what they note in other colleges without a program of professional development.

III

For the veteran wishing to appraise himself over the decades or for a committee trying to gauge his growth, here are ten criteria. They are not measuring rods. They organize a framework within which to observe the growth of a teacher in the community of a liberal college.

First, Is the teacher competent in his field and growing therein? The nature and scope of this competence will vary with the function and goal of the particular college. During the last seventy years our colleges imported mental nutriment in chunks of Teutonic erudition and have thus found it easy to accept postgraduate degrees as conventional evidence of competence of knowledge. The worth of such degrees varies with the standards of the graduate institutions awarding them. In the growth and maintenance of good teaching over the decades other stimulating experiences—of books, events, or mankind—are essential. But whatever formula a given institution uses, it expects the able teacher to know enough about his subject not only to talk intelligently with his pupils, but also to converse, and perhaps write, easily and informingly among colleagues who are considered by others as competent in the same field. No other qualification can be a substitute for competence of knowledge and for increasing competence.

Second, Is he cultivating leadership of his classroom group in such a way as to promote and train mental initiative? Are conference and discussion a constructive part of his class management? A minimum of fifty minutes periodically is supplied him to meet his students, collectively and under cover. The teacher should devise ways, other than personal recollection, of discovering whether he is habitually inclined to monopolize the class period

with uninterrupted exposition and whether he is awakening activity in students' minds. He will encourage periodic doubt in himself as to whether the salutary way in which his students learn is by his unpunctuated monologues. Not infrequently where there is superior teaching, there is eventful and alluring conference by teacher and students.

Third, Does he cooperate readily with colleagues in other departments? Not always is a teacher also an "educator," but if he does possess an educational outlook he knows that at times the aim of the college as a whole is more important than the departmental wish. To achieve this aim may require interplay of minds and materials from several departments, and even reorganization of departments. It may lead to curriculum construction that is unique in college history. Of this the alert veteran is unafraid, for his professional development has familiarized him with the enjoyment of cooperative ventures.

Fourth, Is he engaged in writing and publication? Usually a college likes to note among its growing personnel teachers who write. This writing may be of different kinds. It may record the outcome of original investigation of a problem. If this problem has meaning for an area of knowledge wider than the local college, the publication usually appears in a technical or professional journal. Such publication is evidence of what is commonly termed "research." In some colleges fanfare is blown over this type of publication as chief criterion of teaching ability and of college prestige.

Writing of another type may not publish original knowledge for the first time, but may distribute to a wider circle knowledge that is somewhere already extant. Many colleges are located in small towns where weekly newspapers and radio provide the citizenry with most of the information and ideas they pick up. The occasional or regular publication of letters and articles and participation in radio programs by members of the college faculty is not to be despised, even by the ivory-tower academe, if one believes in service which the college can render in the making of intelligent middle-class decisions.

Fifth, Does he take interest in student life, problems, decisions? In European education the teacher has no responsibilities to students outside his lecture hall. In the American small college, how-

ever, the able teacher has always served a friendly function, for he recognizes that the student's transition from school to college community is often perplexing, and the new ascent among the interests of cultivated and sophisticated minds is confusing. The American college has faith that this confusion may come to be constructive rather than devastating. Friendly association of teachers and students renders this more likely.

Sixth, Does he participate in administrative duties with loyalty, readiness to see others' points of view, and with a sense of humor as to himself? The classic log on which Mark Hopkins sat has swelled to enormous bulk. To keep this physical and financial structure going and undergirding classrooms that shall be free and intellectually fruitful, the teacher may be called upon to assist in administration. Here he meets unexpected conflicts engendered by money, property, and personal prestige. When he shows he can work on such problems with loyalty, with insight into "the strange points of view" of others, and without taking himself and his views too seriously, he is a valuable campus citizen indeed.

Seventh, Has he a philosophical interest, seeking broader and even unfamiliar relationships between ideas? For the convenience of administrators it is our convention to cluster courses into units called "departments." Unphilosophical teachers, fortified within these departmental citadels and eager to demolish the importance of other departments, sometimes try to capture great ideas and imprison them within the departmental citadel. Thus "wealth" becomes the captive of "economists" and "welfare" the prisoner of "sociologists." Fortunately the ideas are clever at escaping, and the college values the kind of teacher, whether in social studies, literature, natural science, or the arts, who furthers their escape and repatriation in the universal life of the mind. Discernment of fresh relationships indicates a mind that is philosophical. Minds of this sort counteract the tribal tendencies of the campus with a saving vision of the Great Society.

Eight, Is his imagination fertile as it plays upon campus and curricular problems? Does he dote on stereotyped academic phrases? A growing teacher cultivates opportunities for personal touch with other teaching centers to see how they meet common problems. Some of these observations are bound to fertilize his

own thinking and teaching. When appointed to a routine job, for instance "faculty adviser" of a student group, he moves ahead of his disguised police function, and the student group becomes an informal seminar with him to do fresh thinking upon its own opportunities. When he glibly utters standard academic phrases like "good student" or "satisfactory marks" or "high standards," he is prepared to review them and make sure he can state what they mean.

Ninth, What service is he giving, if any, to the off-campus community of which he is a part? Unless his college is an ivory tower or his is an ivory heart, the able teacher is inclined to give of himself to off-campus community institutions. His services may range from conducting a series of discussions at a local men's club to writing a report for a national commission. Unless he watches his step, which here means his heart, these services may run away with the quality of his classroom teaching; but in a measure they will enrich it.

Tenth, Has he become monotonous in his instruction? Is he studying the problem of communicating his knowledge? Most of us are acquainted with teachers whose knowledge is plentiful but who cannot communicate it fruitfully to students. Their hindrance may be lack of clear enunciation, repeated "uh-h-h-hs" and "ah-h-h-hs," habitual snuffling, or simply tedious and drab utterance. Or it may be due to the lack of effort and imagination required to arrange information in such form as to be intelligible to the hearer's mind. Unless such a teacher can improve in the use of spoken words his fund of knowledge may give him joy and may illuminate the subject for his colleagues in learning, but it is sterile for many of his students. The fine flower of his effort to transmit knowledge is usually the lecture, often the deadly lecture, and as such the "fine flower" becomes a species of weed producing a kind of sleeping sickness and even a condition allergic to knowledge. An able teacher grows in skilled communication of knowledge.

The college teacher is inclined to admit without argument that civilization, minus his services as high priest of Truth, would deteriorate drastically and even disappear. Just when or how this credo crystallizes into academic complacency is hard to say. There are, however, some veterans who, over the decades, have profited

from vitamins. One prescription which offers a high degree of reliability is a policy and program of professional development. Years of academic security need not give birth to complacency as its banal twin, provided there is an intelligent policy of administrative birth control.

PH.D.'S AND POSITIONS¹

By ERNEST V. HOLLIS

American Council on Education

Last year I spoke to you of modifications in graduate school practices that are being made in certain universities.² Today the report concerns a decade of the placement experience of the institutions that grant the Ph.D. degree. More specifically, this paper is a digest of the employment status, as of September, 1940, of 22,509 living persons on whom the Ph.D. degree was conferred during 1931-1940. These figures include complete data from 94 of the 96 institutions in the United States which grant the Ph.D. degree. The supporting data will appear in a forthcoming publication of the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education.

The importance one attaches to such an analysis rests on the degree to which he accepts as a postulate the assertion that a knowledge of occupational status of members of a profession is indispensable to those who plan to enter it or to those who educate others to enter it. As a corollary, for the topic to be important one must believe the employment trends of the last decade can be helpful in charting a course for the years which lie ahead. It is, of course, not necessary to believe the trends of the depression decade will be projected into the war decade without allowance being made for the changed social forces that impinge upon us. For the time being we must expect the Ph.D. pool of intellectual power, like the resources of industry, to be diverted from ordinary channels to those essential for winning the war. My final assumption is that the average Ph.D. gets reasonably well settled professionally within ten years and, therefore, that the survey shows an essen-

¹ Report presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors in Chicago, Illinois, on December 28, 1941.

² "Problems in the Preparation of College and University Teachers," April, 1941 *Bulletin*, pp. 206-212.

tially accurate generalized picture of the several stages of doctoral employment.

Where the Degrees Were Earned

An overview of the universities granting the Ph.D. degree brings into relief several significant general trends. A curve which rises regularly each year of the decade from 1,910 degrees in 1930-1931 to 2,632 degrees in 1939-1940 would describe the distribution of the 22,509 living Ph.D. graduates by years in which the degree was earned. There was a marked concentration in centers in which the degrees were earned. Roughly 50 per cent of the Ph.D.'s were conferred by nine universities. During the decade 22 universities conferred 75 per cent of the degrees, and 72 universities conferred the remaining 25 per cent. The concentration and diffusion may be expressed another way by saying the highest nine universities granted 11,041 degrees during the decade while the lowest nine institutions granted 34 degrees.

The degree was awarded in almost every area of learning. These were grouped into 50 fields or departments, six of which accounted for 51 per cent of the awards. Chemistry and education alone account for three-fifths and English, history, physics, and zoology for two-fifths of the 51 per cent. At the other extreme, music, mineralogy, law, library science, psychiatry, and Slavic studies together account for only 116 persons or approximately one half of one per cent of the group.

Although the survey covers the depression years, 94 per cent of the Ph.D.'s of the decade were listed by their graduate school officials as gainfully employed in September, 1940. The actual figure probably is somewhat higher, as undoubtedly part of the 3.8 per cent of whom they knew nothing were gainfully employed but probably at work not consonant with Ph.D. training. The geographic distribution of employment shows 41 per cent of the 22,509 Ph.D.'s were employed in California, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. The state with the smallest proportion employed only 13 of this decade's Ph.D.'s. Exactly 138 of these Ph.D.'s found or returned to employment in our outlying possessions, 315 to China, and 649 to all other foreign countries. The wide differences in the proportion of Ph.D.'s em-

ployed in the several states is more apparent than real. When the basis for comparison is the ratio of suitable work opportunities (in academic institutions, government, and industry) available within the state to the number of Ph.D.'s employed during the decade, Alabama and Wyoming, for example, compare favorably with California and New York.

Employment by Type of Institution

A comparison of scholarly workers by gross income was considered and abandoned because it neglects varying costs and so many other factors of job satisfaction. This action was also influenced by an inability of institutions granting the degree to supply adequate salary data. An analysis and a comparison by academic rank were possible but seemed futile since an instructor in one institution may get as much salary and other job satisfactions as a professor or the president of another institution.

It did seem feasible and meaningful to make comparisons by the types of institution in which persons were employed. All types of higher education agencies employed 60 per cent of the decade's output of Ph.D.'s. Of this total, graduate or university level work accounted for 23 per cent, combinations of graduate and undergraduate work 2.5 per cent, college work 32.1 per cent, and junior college work 2.4 per cent. The shift from over three-fourths of the holders of the doctorate being employed in colleges and universities, which Haggerty documented in 1927, indicates a trend of major social significance. The graduate school can no longer be thought of as merely a place to produce college professors. With 26.7 per cent of the Ph.D.'s finding employment in public and private non-academic work, it is evident that the graduate school is definitely in the workaday world and should now consider modifying its degree requirements accordingly. It also should be noted that some 60 per cent of the doctors employed in academic higher education work are in undergraduate colleges where the demand is for a more practical and functional doctor's degree.

The trends of employment over the decade by types of higher education institutions are in keeping with normal expectations for those who have held the degree from ten years to three months or less. The trend in graduate level employment is described by an

evenly descending curve which begins with 26 per cent of the class of 1930-1931 and ends with 21 per cent of the class of 1939-1940. Undergraduate employment is described by a regularly rising curve which begins with 30 per cent of the class of 1930-1931 and ends with 34 per cent of the class of 1939-1940.

The agencies of elementary and secondary education employed 5.5 per cent or 1,239 of the 22,509 Ph.D.'s of the period. The employment trends over the decade for precollegiate levels of school work show a very slight increase: 578 of those who earned the degree in the first half of the decade were so employed as compared with 661 persons for the last half of the period.

The growing fields of public and private nonacademic research and administration probably more than doubled in this decade the number of Ph.D.'s they employed in the 1920's. Federal, state, and local governmental agencies employed 8.4 per cent and industrial and commercial enterprises 18.3 per cent of the persons who earned Ph.D.'s during the 1930's. Of the public total, three-fourths were in federal agencies, one-fifth in state agencies, and one-twentieth in local government. Of the total in private enterprises, a two-thirds majority was employed in chemical and allied industries, in petroleum research, food products research, and as private commercial consultants.

The clergy and other religious workers earned 368 of the Ph.D. degrees awarded during the decade. Private welfare and health agencies employed 318 of the persons who earned the doctorate during the 1930's. It is a matter of more than passing interest that 421 housewives who are not seeking employment earned the doctorate (a majority in the biological sciences) during the decade.

Status by Duties Performed

Another meaningful appraisal of job status is through kinds of duties performed by recipients of the Ph.D. degree. By this criterion 51 per cent of the 22,509 Ph.D.'s of the decade were engaged mainly in teaching, 28.5 per cent were primarily in research pursuits, and 9.3 per cent gave administration as the major duty performed. Over 80 per cent of those in undergraduate college work are teachers and this figure holds for each year of the decade.

From 50 to 75 per cent of the public and private nonacademic workers are engaged in research as against roughly 25 per cent for those in graduate university employment. It is worthy of more than passing note that the departments of education and psychology supply more of the persons in administration than do all of the other 48 departments together.

The field of specialization is an important determiner of the kind of duty likely to be performed. To cite only a few examples: 25 per cent of the Ph.D.'s in chemistry as compared with 78 per cent of those in English are engaged primarily in teaching. Only two per cent of the Ph.D.'s in English are primarily researchers while 59 per cent of the chemists are so employed. Education places 31 per cent of its Ph.D.'s in administrative work while physics so places slightly more than one per cent. As is to be expected, chemistry places 55 per cent and religion 40 per cent of their Ph.D.'s in non-academic pursuits while such fields as history and the languages so place less than two per cent of their Ph.D.'s.

The Unemployment Situation

The analysis of occupational status now turns to Ph.D.'s who are improperly employed, those whose employment status is unknown, those who are unemployable, those not seeking employment, and finally to those who are actually unemployed and who are seeking positions. Altogether 8.7 per cent of the Ph.D.'s of the decade are in these categories.

Despite the dislocations caused by the depression, institutions awarding the degree list a remarkably small number of doctors as employed outside the field of professional specialization. Approximately one per cent (228 persons) of the 22,509 Ph.D.'s were so employed. Random checks indicate, however, that university officials were inclined to take the benefit of the doubt and, for example, list a man employed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture as engaged in research when actually he was performing routine duties unrelated to his special competency. It is probable that the number of gainfully employed Ph.D.'s who are working outside the field of their preparation is double the 228 persons. The figure likely would be three per cent of the total if there were added the

improperly employed from the 864 individuals whose positions or whereabouts were unknown at the place of their graduation.

Among the miscellaneous positions unrelated to doctoral preparation or jobs which might have been secured with little more formal education than is represented by high school graduation were included an infantry lieutenant, a village postmaster, a nurse, a real estate rental agent, a laundry manager, a village banker, a police court judge, and a variety of clerical level workers on W. P. A. projects. Other examples of obvious misplacement include a Ph.D. in Greek who is retailing bakery goods, a Ph.D. in history who operates a retail flower and souvenir shop, and a Ph.D. in Oriental languages who is a podiatrist.

Graduate school officials know nothing whatever about the employment status of 864 Ph.D.'s or 3.8 per cent of the total group. Of course such a generalized figure conceals as much as it reveals. A dozen institutions account for half of the undischarged responsibility usually assumed for placing and keeping in professional touch with the persons on whom the highest earned degree is conferred. Scattering information from other sources permits the inference that three-fifths of the 864 are unemployed, one-fifth gainfully but not professionally employed, one-tenth properly employed, and one-tenth probably unemployable, not seeking employment, or deceased.

In order to determine the amount of actual unemployment it is necessary to remove from the not gainfully employed category those persons who for one reason or another are unemployable and those persons who are not seeking employment. Only 25 persons were listed as unemployable. These range from an insane individual to one incarcerated in a penal institution. Housewives and retired professors constitute most of the group not seeking employment. This classification includes 485 individuals or slightly more than two per cent of the persons awarded the Ph.D. degree during 1931-1940.

These eliminations leave the admitted actual unemployment for Ph.D.'s of the decade at 352 persons, as of September, 1940. This figure would be increased considerably if it were possible to add the actually unemployed from among those whose positions are unknown.

Conclusion

What are the implications of the data for graduate school officials and students? Since our society, in its period of greatest unemployment, absorbed practically all of the employable doctors, the unwary may infer the supply of Ph.D. graduates does not exceed the demand. Such students may feel encouraged to matriculate for a degree, believing they will be readily and profitably employed in the field of their choice. Graduate school officials may be tempted to expand master's degree programs to the doctorate level. Some schools already offering the doctorate as a "side line" may feel justified in expanding offerings or at least going ahead with business as usual.

More cautious and discerning interpreters of the data are likely to make less optimistic inferences. They will suspect that the actual dislocations are greater in nature and number than the warning data of this study indicates. They will know that considerable of the satisfactory initial appointments will prove to be temporary and will later frustrate the process leading to desirable permanent occupational status in institutions of higher education. They probably know that a large portion of the postdoctoral students in our universities are victims of this type of employment dislocation. They cannot forget that permanent appointments in most universities and colleges are more and more going to be limited to replacing those who die or retire and that frequently even these vacancies are not filled promptly.

The more analytical interpreter will notice that the increases in employment were largely in nonacademic public and private positions, in teachers colleges, and in junior colleges. Apparently there are enough job satisfactions in these areas to assure a reasonable flow of doctorates into the fields in normal times. During and following the war there is likely to be a rapidly increasing demand for Ph.D.'s in the agencies of government, industry, and commerce. But satisfactory placement in these fields is likely to depend on a willingness of graduate schools to initiate or modify doctoral programs to suit the functional needs of the fields mentioned in this paragraph.

The more astutely directed graduate school, most likely to keep

abreast of the changing times, will make realistic differentiations in its doctoral programs based on ascertained differences in job demands. This is not to imply that there is no common core of fundamental study and training in research which all candidates for the Ph.D. degree in a given field will pursue. Rather it is to emphasize the differences in the work (and hence differences in preparation needed) of Ph.D.'s in chemistry, for example, who teach in high school, do research for Dupont or the federal government, engage in college or university teaching, or undertake production as chemical engineers for General Foods Corporation.

The graduate school can no longer expect to offer advanced graduate work opportunistically as an incidental side line. Neither can the more ambitious school offer doctoral level work in most of its undergraduate departments. The graduate school of the future must deliberately choose the kinds and levels of teaching, research, and administration for which it will offer the Ph.D. degree. Almost no graduate department can hope to secure the physical facilities, the staff, and the operating budget necessary to prepare teachers, administrators, and research workers for the numerous levels of higher education, for the several levels of precollegiate education, and for the varied specializations in government, industry, and commerce. To be of maximum benefit to its advanced students and to the society which they serve, graduate schools must face realistically all of the issues inherent in restricted offerings, selective admissions, and effective placement. The next decade probably will demand a smaller number of more soundly educated and functionally prepared doctors of philosophy.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN TIME OF WAR¹

By WENDELL BERGE

Department of Justice

In the last month this country has attained a most impressive national unity. All responsible leaders of public thought are now united in their central purpose. Overwhelmingly, our people see eye to eye on the grave necessity of an all-out effort to win the war. Past differences have been buried and forgotten. At last the mighty power of this country has been turned full force against Germany, Italy, and Japan.

We know that this will be a hard war and that it may be a long war. But we are prepared to pay whatever the cost in order to free the world from the curse of the dictators, and to assure a new birth and continuity of man's period of freedom.

And it is for freedom that we fight—freedom from the domination of foreign military power, freedom from economic bondage to alien systems, freedom from suppression of thought, freedom from suppression of speech and religion.

Freedom, in any human society, is a relative thing. It is not absolute. And yet it can exist in greater degree in a society where the citizens are characterized by a high capacity for self-restraint and self-discipline. During the war we shall be compelled from time to time to impose upon ourselves certain temporary limitations upon the exercise of rights which we customarily enjoy. We are willing to do this in the interest of ultimate victory. One of the great virtues of democracy is its flexibility—its ability to expand and contract as the exigencies of a situation require. Time and again in the past when faced with crises, citizens of this country have temporarily submitted to restraints inappropriate in times of peace, and yet, when the crises have passed the rights and liberties thus limited have been restored and their exercise fully resumed by the people.

¹ Address delivered by radio on Station WWDC in Washington, D. C., on January 11, 1942.

Thus the press and radio, which in time of peace have virtually unlimited freedom as to what may be published, accept unhesitatingly in time of war the inevitable censorship on military information and other information useful to the enemy. No one seriously questions the necessity of censorship of this type. We certainly would not want to have our papers publish information with respect to troop movements, the location of battleships and destroyers, the routes of merchant ships and troop transports—information which if acquired by our enemies would probably result in the loss of American life, destruction of American property, and hindrance to our war effort.

And yet, in spite of our willingness to accept necessary restrictions such as the type of censorship to which I have just referred, we are determined that there shall not be any undue or unnecessary sacrifice of freedom even during the war. There is no advantage *as such* in the curtailment of freedom. Indeed, we Americans believe that the power of democracy is stronger even in time of war if a maximum of individual liberty is preserved.

II

All of what I have said points up to the responsibility of prosecutors and courts for the preservation of freedom and the enforcement of laws necessary to the effective waging of the war. Certainly there can be no question that every law designed for the protection of our industrial and military establishments must be vigorously enforced. The plants and industrial processes for the manufacture of war materials must be vigilantly protected against subversive activity. Our investigative agencies must be constantly on the alert for evidence of sabotage, and when offenders are discovered they should be indicted and every effort made to convict them. Likewise, official military and industrial secrets must be carefully guarded. Spies must be ferreted out and punished.

Not only are our people entitled to protection against sabotage and espionage, but they are also entitled to protection against the more insidious effects of subversive foreign propaganda. It has been demonstrated, however, that the most effective weapon against propaganda is exposure rather than suppression. "Propa-

ganda" is a very broad word and includes the circulation of a lot of information and ideas that it is in the public interest to have circulated. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to devise a law that would forbid subversive propaganda without also forbidding good propaganda.

The better method is the one which Congress has adopted. It has required that every person who distributes propaganda as an agent for a foreign principal must register and make a full disclosure of all the facts of his employment. If we know who are the foreign propagandists in our midst we can properly evaluate and discredit the work of those who are subversive. It is a crime in this country to distribute propaganda as a foreign agent without making full disclosure of one's activities to the Government, and under this law we are able to prosecute, and we are prosecuting, those propagandists who fail to obey the law. Laws of this kind should, of course, be enforced to the utmost.

But, in addition to protecting the war program against harmful acts, the pressure always arises in time of war to punish those who merely talk and write. Some people apparently fear that our democracy is such a flimsy structure that it is in danger of being blown over by every windy utterance of irresponsible critics and cranks.

I do not believe, however, that it would promote our national interest or help win the war if we were to divert or distract the people's energies by witch hunts aimed at locking up all our critics and those who still dissent from our course in the war. Moreover, if law enforcement officers were to start jailing people merely for what they think, say, or write, such officers would experience terrific difficulty in devising standards by which to determine what kind of criticism shall be permitted and what kind of criticism shall not be permitted. They would find themselves in a very uncertain and dangerous field.

No better example of this can be found than by referring to the experience of the first World War. During the latter part of our participation in that war the Government embarked on a course of prosecutions on the theory that words in themselves had a "tendency" to encourage resistance to law and interference with the conduct of the war. The test of "tendency" is a very vague test. As

I shall presently show, it can be made to apply to almost anything that people say if you happen to disagree with them.

Let us look at the experience of the first World War. In 1918 Congress passed an amendment to the 1917 Espionage Act, which amendment fortunately was repealed after the war and is not now on the statute books. This Act in very broad language made it criminal to utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language; or any language intended to cause contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute as regards the form of government of the United States, the Constitution, or the flag; or any language intended to incite resistance to the United States or promote the cause of its enemies. You will note that in this Act the test of guilt was really subjective. Any language that was uttered with *intent* to cause certain undesirable results or which had the *effect* of causing them was made illegal. Thus it was not the words themselves that were made illegal, but rather the *intention* of the person who uttered them and the *effect* which they had.

Now, superficially, that test might seem all right. But when you come to analyze it, it is a very dangerous one. The ascertainment of intent in uttering language requires looking into another person's mind. If you don't like what he says, you immediately suspect his intent. If you don't like what he says, you will figure that his words will have a bad effect. If they will have a bad effect, that only furthers your belief that they were said with bad intent. Therefore, bad intent and bad effect are both proved by the fact that you do not like the words.

Thus, for example, if you think the war should be paid for by the sale of bonds and another man advocates new taxes, and if you think that the effect of immediate additional taxes would be bad on the country's morale, you can build a very good case that the person who advocates new taxes is speaking with the intent and the effect of hampering the conduct of the war, and his language becomes seditious.

This example may seem overdrawn, and yet it represents the very type of utterances which were prosecuted during the first World War under the then existing sedition statute. During the first World War men were punished for criticizing the Red Cross and the Y.M.C.A. They were punished for discouraging women

from knitting by the remark "no soldier ever sees these socks." Rose Pastor Stokes was convicted and sentenced to ten years in prison for arguing to a group of women against the war and using the words, "I am for the people and the government is for the profiteers," on the theory that what was said to mothers, sisters, and sweethearts might lessen their enthusiasm for the war. A motion picture producer was convicted and sentenced to ten years for displaying a film called "The Spirit of '76," because it contained such scenes as Patrick Henry's speech, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and Valley Forge. The theory of the prosecution was that in presenting the play the producer designed and intended to arouse antagonism, hatred, and enmity between the American people and the people of Great Britain at a time when Great Britain was an ally of the United States. During the first World War it was regarded as criminal to suggest that there might be some graft in the production of munitions because such a suggestion would cause a lack of confidence in the capacity of the government adequately to carry on the war.

It would be possible to recite at much greater length a veritable chamber of horrors made up of these prosecutions during the last war. We are determined that there will be no such prosecutions during this war if it can possibly be avoided. When cases are selected for prosecution, the test of criminal guilt in regard to the use of language should not be what was in a person's mind when he uttered certain words or, if the imagination is allowed to run rampant, what might be considered to be the effect of his words. I believe that the test should be found in the words themselves and the circumstances under which they are uttered—are they in themselves criminal because they advocate the immediate overthrow of the government or the success of the enemy, or are they words which are uttered under such circumstances that they create a clear and present danger to the safety of the government or the successful conduct of the war?

This so-called clear and present danger doctrine was laid down many years ago by Mr. Justice Holmes in the following language: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting, 'Fire!' in a theater and causing a panic. . . . The question in every case is whether the words used are used in

such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about . . . evils that Congress has a right to prevent When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no Court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right."

III

The principle that there must be a very clear and direct relation between the words spoken and a present danger to the government or its conduct of the war is now well established as the guiding test. Its application to particular cases is, of course, difficult. But we are doing the best we can in the Department of Justice to give it a fair application. On December 15, 1941 we issued instructions to all United States Attorneys, directing that prosecutions for alleged seditious utterances and all other alleged violations of laws affecting free speech shall not be instituted without prior authority of the Department of Justice.

Before issuance of these instructions, several individuals had already been arrested in different parts of the country for speeches they had made or letters they had written. These particular cases were reviewed in the Department, and although the language which the defendants had used was found to be very abusive and vitriolic, it was concluded after careful study that the language in itself was not illegal, and that the circumstances under which it was uttered were not such as to constitute a clear and present danger to the government or to the conduct of the war. Accordingly, these cases, which had been instituted before the issuance of our instructions to the United States Attorneys, were ordered dismissed.

The fact that these dismissals were ordered should not be taken to mean that there will not be any prosecutions of speech violations. It means only that each case will be carefully weighed to determine whether or not the speech in itself is illegal, or the circumstances of its utterance such as to constitute a direct interference with the conduct of the war.

Even before the outbreak of the war we prosecuted an important

case in which the defendants were charged with conspiring to overthrow the government and to interfere with and impair the loyalty, morale, and discipline of the military and naval forces of the United States. I refer to the Minneapolis Socialist Workers Party case, in which the defendants were found guilty of advocating, advising, and teaching the duty of overthrowing our government, and of counseling insubordination, disloyalty, and mutiny by members of the military and naval forces of the United States. This was a case, however, where the government believed, and the jury agreed, that the defendants as part of their conspiracy actually advocated revolution and counseled direct action by members of the armed forces. It is a far cry, in my judgment, from this kind of case, which deserves prosecution, to the futile murmurings of some of the frustrated people who were prosecuted during the first World War.

I submit that the safest and most effective way to counteract the misguided mutterings of the relatively few people who have not joined with us heart and soul in our mighty effort to win this war is by intelligent and vigorous reply to such people's talk, that is, when what they say is important enough to warrant reply. As Professor Chafee, of Harvard University, has said:

We must fight for some of our beliefs, but there are many ways of fighting. The state must meet violence with violence, since there is no other method, but against opinions, agitation, bombastic threats, it has another weapon—language. Words as such should be fought with their own kind, and force called in against them only to head off violence when that is sure to follow the utterances before there is a chance for counter-argument.

.....
The American policy is to meet force by force, and talk by talk.

IV

I would remind you again that the Department of Justice is vigorously prosecuting the real enemies of our war effort whenever we can discover their activity. The recent conviction in Brooklyn of every member of a ring of Nazi spies was a real triumph for law enforcement and for our country's cause. Additional espionage indictments were returned just recently in New York and trials will commence this coming week, emphasizing again that the govern-

ment is on the alert in detecting subversive activity. At least half a dozen foreign agent cases are being actively prosecuted or have just recently been concluded with convictions. Hundreds of investigations of alleged sabotage, espionage, or foreign agent activity are under way, and wherever the evidence warrants, prosecution will result.

But we have set ourselves against those pressures and influences which cry for the prosecution of those people who are merely exercising their right of free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, and whose utterances are not in themselves seditious and cannot be shown to constitute any direct interference with the conduct of the war. I believe that the people of this country are overwhelmingly behind us in this policy, and I believe that it will further be vindicated when later it can be considered in historical perspective.

If the Sedition Act of 1918 had been law during the Mexican War of 1848, James Russell Lowell most certainly could have been prosecuted for sedition on account of the Biglow papers, although they probably had no adverse effect whatever on this country's fortunes in that War. Later administrations thought enough of Lowell to make him United States Ambassador to Spain, and later to Great Britain. Already historical perspective has revealed the mistakes in legislation and prosecution policy in regard to freedom of speech during the first World War. No doubt we will make some mistakes again in this war, but we ought at least to try to avoid making the same ones over again.

We recently celebrated our devotion to the principles of the Bill of Rights on a day set aside by the President for that purpose. Those principles have validity and vitality in time of war as well as in time of peace, and we mean to preserve them. The Department of Justice expects the understanding and support of the American people on this question of fundamental importance, to the end that freedom of speech and other constitutionally guaranteed freedoms shall emerge from this war more deeply ingrained in our way of life than ever before.

PROFESSORS ADMINISTRANT

By DR SCOTT

University of Missouri

In an address given before the Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors,¹ Dr. E. H. Wilkins, President of Oberlin College, discussed the job of being a college president including the problem of faculty-president relations. He extolled the virtues of almost all presidents and gently chided professors for their unjustified suspicion and distrust of presidents upon whom, together with deans, he bestowed the title, "Professors Administrant," because some of them are former professors.

There is something peculiarly intriguing in the term professor administrant. It seems to imply a carry-over of the fundamental educational outlook of a professor to administrative positions. At the same time it suggests also an application to those who are still professors with the implication that they should have a sufficient interest in and understanding of administration to enable the faculty to participate effectively in the process of educational administration. But it is questionable whether the title should be accorded automatically to either the administrator or the professor.

II

Dr. Wilkins' address is a special plea for presidents. No one begrudges them his defense but to permit his high praise of presidents to pass without question might encourage the easy inference that the presidential administration of higher education has been correspondingly excellent. Such an inference is by no means justified. Indeed, it was in part the inadequacy of presidential administration, particularly in reference to faculty-administration relations, which gave rise to the American Association of University

¹ February, 1941 *Bulletin*, pp. 18-28.

Professors. Presidential administration had, in too many instances, become arbitrary and dictatorial to the detriment of scholarship and institutional welfare.

In the course of his discussion President Wilkins asserts that "... a deanship is about five times as hard, as exhausting, as draining, as life-taking, as a professorship . . . and that a presidency is about three times as hard as a deanship."

In this statement he of course refers to quality and not to quantity of effort required. In so far as it refers to the presidency we may well accept the statement at its face value. However, it leads to conclusions which find no expression in Dr. Wilkins' address.

In order to establish a point of reference let us consider first the work of a professorship. Let us take, as typical of institutions with good but not the highest academic standing, a professor in one of the social sciences who teaches three classes, each of which meets three times a week. He keeps abreast of the periodical and general literature in his field and undertakes to make occasional contributions to them.

Suppose the administration should decide that this professor is also prepared to teach in a second field, as some are, and should ask him to schedule his classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and undertake in addition an equal amount of work in the second field on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. The institution would immediately lose standing because of the general belief that the professor could not maintain a high quality of work in either field under such circumstances.

We expect a professor to belong to some particular department, but President Wilkins presents himself as belonging to twenty-four departments and says that "any dean or president who is really on the job does belong to all departments."

Does the president of a large university belong to all of its divisions and all of its departments in the sense that he knows enough about the work of each to give it educational direction and to work out a general educational program? When the requests of different departments or of the deans of different divisions are in conflict, or as a total exceed the financial resources of the institution, does the president know enough about the problems involved to make de-

cisions on the basis of his own personal judgment? When decisions are necessary on matters of selection and promotion of faculty members or the expansion of particular departments is the president's personal knowledge a broad enough base on which to rest them?

President Wilkins' statement appears to imply that the president must effectively integrate the educational services of the institution in his own personal qualifications. But that would require a ratio of presidential capacity to professorial capacity even in excess of fifteen to one. Effective educational administration is a cooperative process. It calls for professors administrant in the ranks of both administrators and professors.

The fact that the president does not and cannot integrate the institution in his own person has a direct bearing upon another problem raised by President Wilkins. He enumerates, as the chief representatives of a larger number, ten different groups "with reference to whom the president has to think and act all the time." These include the trustees, faculty, alumni, students, townspeople, and general public among others. The president represents the university to each of these groups. His representations are limited not only by the limits of his own capacity to express the university but also by the character of the relations of each particular group to the university. No one of his representations is true in any absolute sense. Each is a partial picture. He cannot tell even his board all he knows about the faculty nor would it be politic always to tell his faculty all that he knows or thinks about the board or all of his representations to it.

Each of these various spheres of university relations in which the president must act has its own sequence of events and its own logic of circumstances. This statement follows from the mere fact that each is a distinct sphere of action. In the cumulative process of the president's representation of the university in each of these spheres there inevitably arise conflicts and inconsistencies between his various representations. One of his difficult problems is to recognize these inconsistencies promptly and keep them within bounds. Sometimes it would be hard even for an intelligent fair-minded observer to draw a precise line to show where legitimate policy ends and dishonesty begins. And the president is never a disinterested party in the situation.

III

The presence of various groups "with reference to whom the president has to think and act all the time" involves him in an intimate personal danger. It is a risk which confronts actors and politicians to an even more pronounced degree. The good actor steepes himself in, and in a sense really becomes for the time being, the character which he seeks to portray. When he gives himself up to a series of such presentations over a long period of time, his own personality and character may atrophy from sheer lack of exercise.

It may be objected that the president is merely a man doing a particular job and not an actor playing a part. However, if it is true that he must all the time think and act with reference to each of numerous groups, it seems fair to say that he is playing not one only but numerous rôles. And the observation of concrete cases appears to indicate a danger that the man may become lost in the president.

The professor, in his professional work, has a freedom from limitations which is enjoyed by very few other persons. He may take what appears to him to be true from many authorities and reject any of their views which appear to him not to be sound. It is just as important a part of his function to make his students realize problems not yet solved as it is to give them answers to those which have been solved. Freedom and honesty of intellectual processes make up the essence of an institution of higher education.

The work of a president is in sharp contrast to this freedom of a professor. The president works in a concrete world of action. He cannot take the personal qualities of Mr. X and the scholarly ability of Mr. Y and appoint them to a vacant deanship in the university. He must choose between Mr. X and Mr. Y and other persons on the basis of the available evidence. And, as is characteristic of practical affairs, the evidence is never all in when the decision must be made. There is always a larger or smaller margin of doubt which must be resolved by the judgment of the administrator who is responsible for making decisions.

Men new to the presidential office are apt to arrive at important decisions with serious misgivings and then find that approval by the board and the carrying out of the decisions follow as a mere

matter of routine without causing the slightest ripple on the surface of academic waters. The institutional force and legal authority of the presidency and the board operate with something like the ruthlessness of a Juggernaut and the irresistible momentum of Ol' Man River. This weight of authority provides the presidential office with a large factor of safety. On account of it even poor decisions may be effectively carried out. However, this factor of safety has its disadvantages. In the first place it lulls the president into forgetfulness of the misgivings which have proved unfounded in the past. It makes him surer of himself and overlays his decisions with so much authority that even he cannot tell how far his administration is dependent upon the quality of his judgments and how far it leans upon the authority of his office.

IV

In defending presidents against the charge of being ambitious and seeking personal aggrandizement, Dr. Wilkins makes the following statement: "There is often an element of what may be called ambition in those who take administrative office; but I think that the ambition is typically of this nature: the man feels that there is something in him that isn't being used, wants to be used, and just won't let him rest until it is used."

If we put a man who is motivated by the feelings described by Dr. Wilkins into the position outlined above, we have all of the ingredients of a first-class dictatorship. Indeed, if Dr. Wilkins' statement is true, it is no wonder that we have presidents whose actions are arbitrary and dictatorial. The surprising thing is rather that our situation on that score is no worse than it is.

Paradoxically, perhaps, the prime disqualification for a president should be a messianic complex. Any sort of an inner urge which demands appeasement should disqualify its possessor forthwith. The president should get his inspiration from his task rather than bring it to the job ready-made. An outright cynic who is trying intelligently to promote his own interests will do less damage to an institution than the earnest and sincere individual who confuses the institution's interests and his own and uses the presidential office to realize a personal destiny.

The evolution of the modern large scale university has far outstripped the development of administrative machinery to direct it. In spite of many experiments that have been and are now being made in administration at numerous institutions, the presidency of such an institution still remains a task that is beyond the powers of any man. A reasonably adequate accomplishment of the task would require all the virtues enumerated in Kipling's "If" plus a generous list specially required for the presidential office.

To begin with, the president needs the ability to distinguish between the quality of his administration, the soundness of his judgments, and the authority of the office through which his decisions are applied. And to do that is harder than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. In the next place, the president needs to have and to retain a real sense of humility. He needs to be a keen judge of the ability and the integrity of men. And integrity does not mean that they can be trusted to approve the president's views and actions at all times, under all circumstances. He needs to have unusual powers of abstract thinking. He is the head of a commonwealth of intellectual spheres each of which is a separate and distinct realm of ideas. At the same time his position requires constant adjustment to a concrete world of action in which decisions must be made. His orientation to practical affairs should include a penetrating understanding and tactful treatment of human relations. Above all, he should be a prophet for he is the head of an institution to which society looks for cultural guidance.

Under existing circumstances the best president is likely to be the one who modestly recognizes that the job is too big for him. He may justify himself with the consolation that it would be too big for anyone who might be chosen in his place and that someone must undertake to keep the machinery running. His judgments are likely to be better than those of a president who confuses his own ability and the power of his office and really believes that he is carrying a load fifteen times as heavy as that of a mere professor.

V

Does a good professor regularly go bad when he becomes a president?

President Wilkins says that many professors seem to think that a man who accepts appointment to an administrative position thereby "has suffered some sinister metamorphosis." Quoted more at length, he says, "I submit that to the man himself, to the inner man, not very much happens. He is still whatever he was before. . . . The administrative experience is such that it may bring failure to a man who, as professor, has been successful, but it is not such as to turn a crooked man into a straight one, or to turn a straight man into a crooked one."

This statement is not consistent with the presentation of the presidential office as a difficult position. When men go crooked in the sense that they commit acts which they themselves believe are wrong, they do so under pressure. The student faced with a prospect of failure and a dismissal which he feels will be a disgrace may resort to cheating as the lesser of the two evils. A businessman caught in the destructive current of a business depression does not always maintain the standards of practice which he would observe under normal conditions. In an extreme situation he may, if he has the opportunity, choose embezzlement rather than honest failure. In doing so, however, he is apt to make himself out a martyr by arguing that he is doing it for the sake of his family or for the protection of friends who have invested in his business.

The office of president is a difficult position. Men not infrequently lose it. If they seek to retain it against opposition they are under very great pressure to subordinate the interests of the institution to their own interests. In practice this action is not nearly as crude as it sounds. The administration of the office runs in terms of institutional functions and purposes and their coordination with still broader social purposes. In this process the man who occupies the office tends to become lost in the president. His administration necessarily runs in terms of his conception of institutional and social purposes and it may well be extremely difficult for him to distinguish between an attack upon himself and an attack upon the welfare of the institution.

A president whose actions are arbitrary and dictatorial may well believe that those very actions are proof of his ability as an administrator. Or if he has become so submerged in his position that

he has lost the personal character which he brought to the office, he is not likely to be aware of that fact.

It would be a difficult matter to set up a practical test to show when and to what extent a president "goes bad" or becomes "crooked." But the categorical statement that there is nothing in the presidential office to make a man crooked is not borne out by a critical analysis of the position.

VII

Probably the most serious shortcoming of presidential administration is its typical interpretation of the concept of cooperation. Unquestionably the president is responsible for the organization of a coordinated administration. The men who serve under him as deans of the different divisions of the university must work together effectively. Of course any man who has a broad enough vision to see his own work and that of his division as part of a general educational program will appreciate the need for such cooperation. And such an understanding of the need for it is the most dependable base upon which to build cooperation. Indeed, we might well go so far as to say that in educational administration cooperation should rest solely upon intellectual grounds.

However, it may not always be easy to judge in advance whether a given man will lend cooperation upon intellectual grounds. It is easier to pick a complacent individual with personal qualities leaning in the direction of cooperation. Because presidents do not concentrate on the intellectual grounds for cooperation, the professor with a vital imagination and active intellectual interests often acquires a reputation for being a good man but not quite the type for an administrative position.

It would be a gross misstatement to say that deans are appointed on the basis of their personal loyalty to the president. The argument here is merely that there is a bias in the selective process which places too much emphasis on the personal qualities of the men selected.

When the president appoints university committees, it often happens that there is a considerable representation of deans on important committees. This helps to groove the deliberations of

such committees along the lines of administrative thinking and to make them more cooperative. Also, the selection of committee members who are not deans is itself subject to the same bias as the selection of deans. The question is not one of bad appointments but rather the cumulative effect of a bias in the selection of appointees regardless of their merits individually considered.

The administration of a university should be such that the president may on occasion find himself defending a policy before the faculty in the face of an adverse report by a committee on educational policy somewhat as the government may be called upon to defend its policies under a parliamentary system. The organization and operation of the university's administrative machinery should freely permit the development of this type of situation.

If the president makes cooperation a direct goal in building up the institution's machinery of administration, his action tends to prevent the development of such situations and in so doing he is guilty of the same offense as the classroom teacher who prevents the raising of troublesome questions by the bright boys in the class. Such a policy does not represent cooperation with the faculty. Instead it is subordination of the faculty.

Any administration which distrusts the faculty sooner or later will be distrusted by the faculty; and the presidential conception of cooperation commonly implies an unintentional and often unwitting distrust of the faculty. The president who makes cooperation a direct goal of administrative organization may very well achieve the form and appearance of cooperation without realizing that he has destroyed its spirit. The presidential conception of cooperation is the most insidious and the most common basic cause of unhappy president-faculty relations.

VIII

The term professor administrant deserves a better meaning than the mere designation of an executive who formerly was a professor. What institutions of higher education most need is the development of a little bit of the irresistible momentum of Ol' Man River in the administration of the educational side of the institution. Such a result can be achieved only by effective organization

of the intellectual resources of the institution. Professors generally must be shaken out of their narrow orbits and made to become in some degree at least professors administrant. Boards and the president himself need to be educated to the fact that educational administration is a cooperative process. If the president can accomplish these results he will establish an effective community of interests between administration and faculty. Then and then only will he really deserve the title "Professor Administrant."

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Exchange of Correspondence with Brazilian Professors

The União Cultural Brasil-Estados Unidos has supplied the American Association of University Professors with a list of Brazilian professors who wish to correspond with colleagues in the United States. The suggestion originated with Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Members of the Association are urged to cooperate in this exchange of correspondence in the interest of promoting closer cultural relations between the two countries. Among the subjects represented by the professors are the following: Accounting, Advertising, Agriculture, Art, Biology, Botany, Cardiology, Chemistry, Dermatology, Dentistry, Economic Geography, Education, Electrotherapy, Endocrinology, Engineering, Genetics, Geology, History, Hygiene, Indian Languages, Law, Literature (North American, Portuguese), Mathematics, Metallurgy, Neurology, Pathology, Philosophy, Physics, Physiology, Political Science, Psychiatry, Sociology, Surgery, Tropical and Infectious Diseases, Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases, Urology, Veterinary Medicine, and Zootechny.

Inquiries should be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. He will supply the inquirer with the name and address of a prospective correspondent.

Regional Meetings

Baton Rouge, Louisiana

The Louisiana State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors was host to a regional meeting of the Association in Baton Rouge on March 6 and 7. Dele-

gates were present from the University of Alabama, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Tulane University, Xavier University, and Southwestern Louisiana Institute. More than 50 members of the host chapter attended various sessions of the conference, and approximately 150 persons were present at the evening meeting on March 6.

The sessions began at 2:00 P. M. on Friday, March 6, with a round-table discussion of "Tenure in Southern Universities," at which Professor George Pope Shannon of the University of Alabama, a member of the national Council, presided. Professor Logan Wilson of Tulane University presented the results of a tenure questionnaire which he had sent to a number of southern university presidents. The tenure regulations for institutions under the control of the Louisiana State Board of Education were explained by Professor Karl E. Ashburn of Southwestern Louisiana Institute. A proposal that the Association recommend to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools a clarification of its probationary provisions regarding tenure was introduced by Professor Gerard Hinrichs of Xavier University. Professor Jefferson B. Fordham of Louisiana State University spoke of the objectives and legal aspects of tenure. Dean W. H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University described the tenure regulations at his institution and explained the plan under consideration for those faculty members going into military or civil-defense work. Professor A. J. Carlson of the University of Chicago suggested that cases of tenure violations are pretty much the same throughout the country and that frequently both sides involved are somewhat at fault.

At 4:00 P. M. Professor Eric Voegelin, formerly of the University of Vienna but at present Visiting Professor of Government at Louisiana State University, addressed the conference on "Academic Tenure and Academic Freedom in European Universities Today." After pointing out that the word *today* in his title precluded any remarks, he proceeded to explain the status of European professors, especially in Austria, as civil servants and to trace the protection of science and its teaching in Europe. He showed wherein this involved the selection of professors and the protection of the subjects taught in the traditional faculties

of law, philosophy, theology, and medicine. He took full cognizance of the philosophical implications of the subject in surveying the development of the freedom of science in Europe.

At the evening session President Campbell B. Hodges of Louisiana State University welcomed the visiting delegates to the campus, and Professor A. J. Carlson delivered a thoughtful lecture on "The University and the Present Crisis." Beginning with the proposition that war and education are incompatibles, for the former attempts to scorch the earth and the latter tries to make two blades of grass grow where one formerly appeared, he pointed out that war inevitably influences a university adversely and suggested that a re-examination of the moorings of education for democracy was in order. He specifically opposed granting a bachelor's degree after two years' study based on the assumption that general education may be completed at the end of two years in college; he opposed increased regimentation and autocratic dictation within colleges and attempts at basic educational reconstruction during the crisis. More positively, he suggested a tightening of the intellectual belt by both teachers and students and pointed out the aid that teachers could offer in the preparation of men for special services in the armed forces and in their own investigation of scientific problems for the government; he argued for a continuation of the training of doctors, chemists, and engineers without a shortening of the usual period of preparation. He concluded with a plea for the creation of free minds and a criticism of those who would shield youth from real work and who would relieve those past middle age of all responsibilities.

On the morning of March 7 the final session was held—a round-table discussion of "University Mobilization and the War Effort." Professor Marie J. Weiss of Tulane University, a member of the national Council, presided. Professor George Pope Shannon traced in detail the effects of the war on the faculty and students at the University of Alabama. Professor Paul Delaup of Southwestern Louisiana Institute spoke of the desirability of deferring students and teachers in fields where manpower is low and of the necessity for retaining the essential function of a university. Professor Harriet S. Daggett of Louisiana State University

explained the University's program of cooperation in the war effort. According to Professor R. J. Harris of Louisiana State University, the university faculty should be looked upon as a republic of scholars and a society of gentlemen instead of a group of men lodged in a series of buildings to help students amass credits; salaries should be maintained and perhaps raised during the crisis, and the civil liberty of freedom of speech should be carefully guarded on the college campus. Professor A. J. Carlson, emphasizing the necessity for focusing on essentials, nutrition instead of knitting, insisted that the university still has research and scholarship to engage in, come what may. In conclusion, Professor Carlson proposed that in the peace to come a system of adult education should be worked out to prevent a repetition of the follies and futilities of past years.

New York City

The Regional Conference of the members in the metropolitan district of New York City met on March 21 at Hunter College. Sixty-two persons, representing twelve institutions, attended the conference.

At the morning session Dr. Francis J. Brown, Consultant of the American Council on Education and Executive Secretary of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the National Committee on Education and Defense, spoke on "Higher Education Organized for War." Dr. Brown drew a sharp comparison between the organization of higher education for war in 1917 and in 1941. In 1917 the colleges were totally unprepared, while between September, 1939 and December, 1941 the National Committee on Education and Defense had called together numerous agencies and worked out many problems. Dr. Brown dealt further and specifically with various aspects of Selective Service as related to the colleges. He pointed also to the vast educational program, the largest ever attempted in the world, now carried on in the armed forces, a program directed both to the war and to the subsequent peace. Dr. Brown considered that the major problems for the colleges are the proper allocation of man and woman power now and the creation of a long-range plan for education during and

after the war. In the latter connection he urged the necessity of continued liberal education in the training of leaders and voiced the hope that the colleges would not allow themselves to become "trade schools with a halo." Professor Rudolf Kagey of New York University led the discussion of Dr. Brown's stimulating and highly informative address.

At the luncheon which followed the morning session, Professor I. L. Kandel of Teachers College, Columbia University, spoke on "Policies in Regard to Higher Education to Be Avoided in the Present War," after which Professor Joseph Allen of The City College read a group of reports on the same topic, which he had gathered from college teachers and administrators.

Washington, D. C.

A luncheon meeting of Association members in the area of Washington was held on March 14 at Wesley Hall. There were 51 persons in attendance, representing several government departments and the following institutions: American University, Blue Ridge College, Catholic University of America, George Washington University, Georgetown University, Goucher College, Hood College, Howard University, Johns Hopkins University, Mary Washington College, University of Maryland, Medical College of Virginia, and Washington College.

Professor Monroe H. Martin of the University of Maryland was the presiding officer. The principal speaker was Dr. Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association. Dr. Ford is a Charter Member of the American Association of University Professors; for many years he was Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota and during 1938-1941 was President of that institution. In discussing the subject of "The Impact of the War Upon the Educational System," Dr. Ford stated that education must face several serious problems. Income from endowments and from student fees has decreased, especially in the law and graduate schools and in the teachers colleges. At the same time many costs, especially of supplies, have increased, and in some instances research must be curtailed because necessary materials cannot be imported. As teach-

ers are drawn into the armed forces or other government services the reserve supply of competent teachers will be depleted and colleges and universities will have to make replacements from less competent persons. The present emphasis on education will draw many students to the universities at the conclusion of the war. However, while the war intensifies the difficult position of many institutions at the present time, education should ultimately receive certain benefits. In conclusion Dr. Ford urged that the humanities not be neglected during this war, for they are part of the American way of life which we are defending.

The General Secretary of the Association, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, spoke briefly and informally on some of the aspects of the war in relation to higher education.

Chapter Activities

University of New Hampshire. The chapter has undertaken to arouse group interest in the purchase of government defense bonds, a committee having been appointed at the January meeting to study the matter. A report was presented and adopted by the chapter at its February meeting. The plan provides for systematic purchase of bonds, with staff members authorizing the business office to deduct certain amounts from their monthly salary checks. The committee suggested the following as guides of the minimum amounts to be pledged: 2% on incomes up to \$2000, 3% on \$2000 to \$3000, and 4% or 5% on more than \$3000. A tentative quota of \$2500 per month was set for the entire campus.

[Copies of the announcement letter and the enclosed plan are on file in the Association's Washington office. The General Secretary will be pleased to make them available to other chapters which may be interested in instigating plans similar to that of the University of New Hampshire.]

University of Rochester. On December 5, 1941 Mr. Emil Hanke, Field Secretary of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, gave an informative talk on general insurance and annuity problems before a representative group of Association members and other

staff members of the University of Rochester. During the informal discussion of T. I. A. A. contracts and of other insurance plans, it was pointed out by Mr. Hanke that chapters of the Association might play an important rôle in facilitating further study of life insurance and retirement questions.

Xavier University. The annual banquet of the chapter was held on the evening of February 5 with several guests from other institutions in attendance.

Dr. Peter A. Carmichael, Professor of Philosophy at Louisiana State University, presented an address on "The Rôle of Classical Studies and Philosophy in Liberal Education." He criticized the recent trend in commercializing a large section of higher education, stating that the true function of a college or university is to inform and confer enlightenment and thus to give to the world learned and cultivated minds. Dr. Carmichael outlined the following as desirable in an institution of higher learning: (1) a curriculum reflecting exercise of discrimination in all of its content, (2) exacting demands in every course, (3) original and forceful minds to conduct the courses, (4) hospitality to ideas, and (5) a community of students devoted to learning. To persons whose intellectual range is unlimited, Greek and Latin are incalculably valuable, if only as teaching our own language. The range of philosophy is almost the same as knowledge itself, its distinctive nature being reason. He emphasized in conclusion the need for liberal education as the groundwork for high competence and achievement in science, literature, and art.

Representatives

The following members have accepted the invitation to represent the American Association of University Professors on the occasion indicated:

Richard H. Shryock (University of Pennsylvania) and W. Brooke Graves (Temple University) at the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, April 10 and 11.

Manning J. Dauer (University of Florida) at the inauguration of Dr. Doak S. Campbell as President of the Florida State College for Women, February 21.

S. A. Mitchell (University of Virginia) at the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Hollins College, May 17.

REVIEWS

Free Speech in the United States, by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 634. \$4.00.

When Professor Chafee's earlier book, *Freedom of Speech*, appeared in 1920, the import of the constitutional guarantee was being acrimoniously canvassed, both in litigation and in public discussion of what dissenters ought to be allowed to say. In 1907 an opinion for the Supreme Court written—surprisingly enough—by Mr. Justice Holmes had intimated that the clause secured little more than what Blackstone had praised as the true liberty of the press: the absence of *previous* restraint upon publication. The Crown, at the time of our Independence, had had no machinery for preventing publication; but anyone who made bold to criticise the government, though his statements were true and his motives patriotic, had laid himself open to punishment for seditious libel. Our Federal Bill of Rights had guaranteed "freedom of speech and of the press;" but then the Sedition Act of 1798 had made it a crime to publish false, scandalous, and malicious writings against the government, either House of Congress, or the President, with intent to defame or to excite against them the hatred of the people. Federalist judges had enforced this statute with alacrity: as Chafee says, "In those prosecutions words were once more made punishable for their judicially supposed bad tendency, and the judges reduced the test of intent to a fiction by inferring the bad intent from this bad tendency." (P. 27.) So the citizen's constitutional right to speak and publish had been precarious and uncertain; it remained so at the time when the World War and the Russian Revolution raised a cloud of criticism of the government's policies. Could men be constitutionally punished under the Espionage Law for utterances whose tendency was to weaken the nation's ardor for the war, or perhaps for the intervention in Russia? In March, 1919, in the Schenck Case,

Justice Holmes secured the assent of all his colleagues to a broad version of the constitutional limitation:

The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create *a clear and present danger* that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree.

Words were not to be punishable for their own sake, nor because of some conjectural tendency in the future, but because of the present likelihood of producing that which Congress may prevent, *e. g.*, a refusal to respond to the draft. Before this construction of the First Amendment was announced, however, the trial courts had given themselves over to convicting men on the "bad tendency" of their words. Thereafter in the application of the "clear and present danger" test to actual situations the other Justices soon parted company with Holmes and Brandeis, JJ. To meet the urgent need for some critical examination of English and American experience with the law of sedition, Chafee's first book, *Freedom of Speech*, was written.

Now, as we are engaged upon another war, the present book with its enlarged discussion of this great theme belongs in the very forefront of important reading. Professor Chafee addresses his treatise to a wide audience. In the introduction he says:

I am now directing myself to all thoughtful citizens, whether lawyers or laymen. In both revision and fresh writing, I have endeavored to phrase every paragraph so that it will be intelligible to a man or woman without legal training . . . My main purpose in writing this new book is to make men and women realize the great value of their own tolerance to the welfare of the nation.

In all this the author has been completely successful. It is a book of particular significance for university teachers.

Part I, "A Survey of Freedom of Speech in 1920," is substantially a reprint of the original book, running from the federal Espionage

Acts of 1917 and 1918 to the purge of the five Socialists from the New York Assembly in 1920. "The First Decade of Peace" discloses another chamber of horrors, wherein Left-Wing Socialists cast such frightful shadows that men of firm mind were put in fear, and criminal syndicalism statutes and other devices of suppression were frantically invoked. In the development of constitutional doctrine the major event was the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Gitlow Case*. The defendant, convicted under a New York statute penalizing the advocacy of criminal anarchy, had carried to the Supreme Court the contention that the act as applied deprived him of his liberty without due process of law within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. While the "liberty" of that clause had been expanded by conservative judges to protect economic enterprise from public control, there was up to that time no adjudication extending the scope of the Amendment to State action restraining the expression of opinion. The permanent significance of the *Gitlow Case* is that the Court was unanimous in placing freedom of speech among the fundamental liberties secured by the due process clause. In the immediate outcome *Gitlow's* conviction was sustained, Holmes and Brandeis dissenting, on the view that the legislature might reasonably have concluded that such advocacy would constitute a clear and present danger and—paraphrasing here the language which Holmes and Brandeis were wont to use in other contexts—the statute must be sustained unless patently arbitrary and unreasonable. *Gitlow* was pardoned by Governor Smith. His case became a landmark establishing a constitutional right of action against State laws punishing mere advocacy.

In narrating the happier events of the next decade Mr. Chafee assigns the place of honor to Chief Justice Hughes. Of the Chief's uncompromising devotion to the liberty of human conscience and thought there can be no doubt, although if the scope of inquiry were extended to certain other aspects of what may be called liberalism the record would become a trifle obscure. Starting with the clear and present danger gloss upon the First Amendment, and the concession in *Gitlow's Case* that the power of the State was subject to a like restraint, the Court proceeded, in a series of cases ranging from *Yetta Stromberg* saluting a red flag in

the California mountains to Norman Thomas in the den of Mayor Hague, to find that there had been no showing of any clear and present danger such as would allow restrictions to be constitutionally applied. In 1938 the first of several ordinances against handbills went down, and in 1940 the dissemination of information concerning a labor dispute—peaceful picketing—was brought within the area of free discussion protected by the Constitution. Then Congress stopped the drift toward toleration by enacting the misnamed Alien Registration Act of 1940, in reality a sedition law with enormous possibilities of abuse if it gets out of control. One of the vicious features of this type of statute is the savage sentences which are authorized—and imposed. "A trial judge entrusted with a ten-year maximum sedition act behaves like a fifteen-year old boy behind the wheel of a car that can reach eighty miles an hour. It does." (P. 480.)

The last and some of the most stimulating sections of the book are devoted to the history of the law of sedition, a discussion of methods of public control over books, plays and films, and, in conclusion, an affirmation of the continuing need for attachment to the processes of reason as America moves into the new storm center. There are useful appendices cataloguing Federal and State laws affecting speech—an array which may prove appalling to persons unacquainted with the statute books. In all, there are six hundred very wise pages, worthy of the highest praise.

Lawyers of large mind, especially when analyzing problems of public power, think in terms of interests and not of rights. ". . . there are individual interests and social interests, which must be balanced against each other, if they conflict, in order to determine which interest shall be sacrificed under the circumstances and which shall be protected and become the foundation of a legal right. It must never be forgotten that the balancing cannot be properly done unless all the interests involved are adequately ascertained, and the great evil of all this talk about rights is that each side is so busy denying the other's claim to rights that it entirely overlooks the human desires and needs behind that claim." (P. 32.) Of course the balancing of interests is not a mechanical operation, and each individual will consult his own experience and faith in evaluating competing claims. But we have advanced far

if we can forbear to pose dogmatic absolutes and can get down to the assessment of relative social values. No one could be more candid than Mr. Chafee in recognizing considerations bearing away from freedom of expression in particular situations. Thus he has some reservations as to certain recent cases, notably *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, which extend constitutional protection to "peddlers of ideas and salesmen of salvation in odd brands" whose method of securing an audience is to insinuate themselves into one's home. "I cannot help wondering whether the Justices of the Supreme Court are quite aware of the effect of organized front-door intrusions upon people who are not sheltered from zealots and impostors by a staff of servants or the locked entrance of an apartment house." (P. 407.) Another part of the *Cantwell* Case affirmed the right of Jehovah's Witnesses to carry the gospel by phonograph into a Roman Catholic neighborhood and to play records, outrageous to the ears of those who had been invited to listen with no intimation of the nature of what they were to hear. This does some violence to Chafee's conception of the life of the spirit—and, it may be worth adding, is inconsistent with the result reached by the English courts in a like case. Perhaps most of us today would give freedom of religion a less evangelistic significance and think mainly of the interest of the worshipper in ministering to his own needs, whereas to Chafee, as to the reviewer, the importance of free speech on temporal affairs is not primarily to the one who wants to speak, but to the many who might profit by hearing. "The victims of state trials are frequently the precursors of statesmen." (P. 515.)

One of the most illuminating aspects of the book is the explanation of how largely the substance of liberty is dependent upon matters of legal remedies and procedure. Fox's Libel Act of 1792, merely by transferring from the province of the judge to the jury the right to say whether the utterance was seditious, completely changed the law in action and made it safe to say whatever a jury of twelve shopkeepers would think expedient to be said. But this adjustment has ceased to be any safeguard of liberty when federal jurors chosen from among the well-to-do sit in judgment upon a communist. In his discussion of the California I. W. W. injunction, Professor Chafee explains just what happens when the equity

injunction is wrested from its appropriate place in the legal system to do duty as a "get-peace-quick" remedy for labor troubles. And his reflections on the motivations of judges, at page 360, will be refreshing to those who have had too much over-simplified economic interpretation of the Supreme Court.

"In the long run the public gets just as much freedom of speech as it really wants." (P. 564.) It has been one of the great fallacies of the American political credo to suppose that with written constitutions judicially enforced we have a mechanical substitute for active civic virtue. Unless it is embedded in the *mores* of a people to maintain discussion even in times of crisis, the safeguards of tolerance are certain to break down all along the line, from the private citizen suddenly turned vigilante up through justices of the peace and prosecutors and jurymen to the Justices in Washington—a process which the author exposes in detail.

If our present expenditure of blood and treasure is to yield any commensurate return in an ordered world, we must of course avoid the moral bankruptcy into which we fell after the Armistice. On this theme the book closes. During the first World War,

wrong courses were followed like the despatch of troops to Archangel in 1918, which fatally alienated Russia from Wilson's aims for a peaceful Europe. Harmful facts like the secret treaties were concealed while they could have been cured, only to bob up later and wreck everything. What was equally disastrous, right positions, like our support of the League of Nations before the armistice, were taken unthinkingly merely because the President favored them; then they collapsed as soon as the excitement was over, because they had no depth and had never been hardened by the hammer-blows of open discussion. And so when we attained military victory, we did not know what to do with it. No well-informed public opinion existed to carry through Wilson's war aims for a new world order to render impossible the recurrence of disaster.

In 1941 the same problem confronts us, only it is infinitely more difficult. The task of today is to produce airplanes, guns, and battleships. The task of tomorrow is to throw out the half-crazed ruler who threatens to destroy the civilization painfully built up since Marathon. The task of the day after tomorrow is to rebuild that civilization far more solidly than in 1919.

Perhaps another might have written a book with all these merits, yet it must have lacked a certain quality of Chafee's book. To set out a branch of law in language which is tight yet sprightly, to expose intolerance with indignation but not rancor, to speak with deep sincerity that avoids preaching, and at the end to leave readers unwearied and convinced that their guide must also be a great fellow—this is what Professor Chafee has achieved.

Stanford University

CHARLES FAIRMAN

American Journalism: A History of Newspapers in the United States through 250 Years, 1690-1940, by Frank Luther Mott. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. 772. \$4.25.

If the printing press has contributed more than any other mechanical invention to the advancement of civilization, then it is equally true that its greatest product, the newspaper, has helped more than any other single agency to make our experiment in human democracy workable. Lord Bryce pointed out long ago that this American experiment must have broken down were it not for the fact that our states proved to be an assemblage of experiment stations in which notions of government might be tried out and abandoned, if they did not work, without endangering the entire structure. Town-meeting democracy was really not a difficult problem at first, in a homogeneous community; but when that community became three thousand miles wide it was impossible for citizens to argue with fellow citizens and arrive at workable compromises without some agency which extended the seeing and hearing powers of individual debaters. This agency was the press; and it developed into an efficient machine just in time to prevent a vast experiment from falling to pieces because of unwieldy size.

A curious lethargy marked the development of the printing press. Other important inventions such as the steam engine were improved from year to year until in a short time the original models were almost wholly discarded; but five hundred years after the printing press was invented, printers were still using machines as simple as Johannes Gutenberg's; and they had waited three hundred years for any significant improvements.

The same curious lethargy has marked the appearance of adequate histories of American journalism, or as newspaper men would prefer to phrase it, American newspapers. There have been several attempts, and all of them have been notably weak in one aspect or another. Either they did not sufficiently assemble the facts, or having assembled them, they did not dare present them without glossing over some of the rougher surfaces.

Frank Luther Mott in his *American Journalism* shows no lack of industry in the matter of research, and no lack of courage. The only possible ground for complaint is in the style, which is perhaps too coldly factual for a story so rich in romance. From the little news sheets, some patriot, some tory, within the various revolting colonies, to the great trial which so unexpectedly established for the press a degree of freedom not yet dreamed of in other parts of the world, to the great battles between rival papers in the evil days when partisan journalism was born, to the lives of the robber barons of newspaperdom—the whole story is a welter of drama and romance; and it takes a cool-headed historian to move through it calmly and quietly and factually.

Mott's is a good book, undoubtedly the best we have on the subject. Lucy Salmon of Vassar would have made a better one if she could have continued that monumental undertaking of hers, "The Newspaper and the Historian," "The Newspaper and Authority," and then out of it all evolved a complete picture, both objective and philosophic. But perhaps any ambitious historian of the American press still stands a little too near even the beginnings of it all to be able to view in their true proportions the catastrophic changes in the past few years which have merged or eliminated great newspapers and have placed others in chain gangs; recent years which have seen the disappearance of the great editor-owner and the exaltation of the business manager in his place. No historian can tell us what these things mean now, or what they will mean. But the bare facts up to 1940 may be found in this book, and if the reader has any gift of prophecy or interpreter's power he will find here the raw material spread clearly before him, and he may do his own philosophizing.

Union College

BURGES JOHNSON

They Went to College, by C. Robert Pace. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1941. Pp. xii, 148. \$2.50.

They Went to College is a thought-provoking social analysis as of 1937 of the everyday living of 951 young people between the ages of 25 and 34 who studied at the University of Minnesota between 1924 and 1933. The group was representative of four entering classes of the four largest colleges of the University and had in it 473 men and 478 women. Of the group, 486 persisted to graduation and ten per cent of these earned advanced degrees; 465 failed to graduate, about one-third of whom did less than a year of college work.

The cooperation of these young adults was secured through asking them to help the University staff improve education for students now entering the University. In keeping with this focus the questionnaire of more than a thousand items was titled "Building the University of Tomorrow." It sought evidence calculated to reveal the activities, the procedures, and the faith men live by (1) in personal matters, (2) in home and family life, (3) in socio-civic affairs, and (4) in earning a living.

The findings of such a study are valuable for evaluating the influence of a college experience, among the other factors, in determining the quality of adult living. If one accepts the general truth of the assumption that the future needs of present students will not differ substantially from the needs of young adults of today, the data are of major value in planning college living for today. Of course the patterns of society change and the activities and needs of individuals change with them but, for the reviewer, this does not make the basic assumption underlying this book either static or otherwise untenable. He believes that in any society of which our young people are likely to be a part the individual will need to find working solutions to his problems of personal adjustment, philosophy, health, and the use of leisure; problems of family relationships, raising children, and earning a living; problems of responsible participation in the social and civic affairs of the community and the nation. These fundamental problems are well nigh universal and persist as long as life lasts. Therefore, those of us who want to educate for more effective living have much

to learn from studying the successes, failures, and aspirations of this representative cross-section of the American college student population.

It is not possible for this brief review to name or interpret the specific findings under the four major headings for graduate and non-graduate groups, for groups by sex, marital status, etc. Dr. Pace has drawn several clear-cut generalizations in each of the four broad areas of adult living probed by the questionnaire and by the interviews which supplemented it. Except as altered by paraphrasing liberties necessary to save space, Dr. Pace concludes:

These young people were not much concerned about philosophy or religion, and they were content with this lack of concern. Their leisure time activities were almost entirely passive. The women were interested in effecting home economies yet they engaged in many uneconomical practices. A significant minority tended to give up in the face of complex family relationships.

Our analysis showed that many of the activities required by their jobs were those for which they had received no training in the University. We found many of these young adults unconcerned about social, governmental, and economic developments that might affect their jobs.

There were many inconsistencies between their expressions of interest in socio-civic affairs and their social behavior. They were interested in broad national problems but not in specific attempts at solutions. They had little interest in community affairs. They said they wanted more reliable sources of information but they subscribed to biased magazines.

In summary, it seems possible to group these young people into two overlapping categories: the first, those showing evidence of apathy and complacency; and second, those showing failure to appreciate interrelationships among problems.

Among the implications of the study for educators, Dr. Pace includes the following significant paragraph:

The results of this survey may be coincidental, and they may not indicate a cause and effect relationship; but it is worth pointing out that the young adults who came through this fragmentary, specialized training have by and large failed to see their own lives and their contemporary world as parts of an integrated whole. Their educational programs had little unity or coherence, and their

lives are fragmented; they appear unaware of interrelationships. Herein lie serious implications that have not yet been fully realized by college educators or generally provided for in college curriculums.

These conclusions make evident a predilection for the needs, interests, and problems of students' approach to general education. Those who subscribe to this position will wish the study had even more boldly proposed certain theses about what to teach undergraduates. Naturally those who advocate a mastery of subject matter as the essential objective in general or liberal education will not be interested in the close reading necessary to get a working knowledge of the investigation.

Since the body of the report is aimed primarily at professionals it might well have had at least a summarizing section in the vernacular of the layman. It should be pointed out, however, that Dr. Pace never uses a fifty-cent word of professional jargon when a five-cent everyday word is available. *They Went to College* will stimulate the thinking of any person concerned with undergraduate curriculum problems. It should be on the priorities list of educationists, sociologists, and curriculum study committees.

American Council on Education

ERNEST V. HOLLIS

Public Schools and British Opinion Since 1860, by Edward C. Mack. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. 511. \$3.75.

The study of a nation's system of education sheds revealing light on the aspirations of that nation. Students of German education could see fertilizing in the schools of that nation the seeds of the present world conflict. *Public Schools and British Opinion Since 1860* is an important study of one phase of the British system of education—the institutions educating the upper class youth of England. The behavior of many of the leaders in England at the time of Munich takes on new meaning as the story of the public schools and the paralleling contemporary opinion of these schools unfold. The significance of Dr. Mack's study is indicated by a statement made more than two decades ago by the

British Ambassador to the United States, Sir Auckland Geddes, who in addressing the National Citizens Conference on Education said: "It ultimately matters more to your State Department than any other thing in the whole range of their manifold duties to know the color of the education being given in the British Empire, in France, in Germany, in all the countries of South America—yes, in all the nations of the world; for, if your Secretary of State knows, let us say, the French color of education, he will know well how the nation will be thinking ten years hence."

Dr. Mack has made a scholarly contribution to the fields of Comparative Education and Comparative Politics. A national system of education is one of the most sensitive of all national institutions in that, as Sir Michael Sadler has said, the things outside the school "govern and interpret the things inside." This the author makes clear by showing how the ideas and interests of the dominant class of England determined the history of the English public schools.

As in his first treatise, *Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780 to 1860*,¹ Dr. Mack utilizes a copious body of pamphlet literature, reminiscence, history, prose, fiction, and poetry to set forth the traditions and criticisms of the English public schools. In the earlier work the author concluded that "Public School history has been inextricably interwoven with the general economic and social developments of the British upper classes," and these schools "have always responded, despite their inherent conservatism to the pressure of historic forces." Since 1860, he finds Public School history has to some extent followed this same course, but with one marked exception. Developments such as the scientific movement succeeded in winning some recognition, whereas the movement with which the labor party has been identified has been excluded from the public schools. Evidently, science could be accepted without disturbing the *status quo* but the reforms demanded by labor were too revolutionary. The public schools became a bulwark against change and, judged by the numbers attending, they achieved their greatest popularity in the ten years after the war.

¹ Reviewed in December, 1939 *Bulletin*.

The rights which the public schools had "grudgingly conceded to middle-class liberals in 1861" were thus denied the labor party. A partial explanation of the aloofness of the adherents to the public schools is that, unlike the middle classes of the 1830's, the labor party has not yet won economic power. Labor, therefore, has been "unable to effect either a political, an economic, a social, or an educational revolution." Anticipating the Marxian criticism that he has put "the cart before the horse," Dr. Mack states, "that is the way things have happened in England and, I suspect, elsewhere as well. How one wins economic power is, of course, another story, a story which usually stretches over long periods of evolution. Whether this process can be telescoped, through the agency of the convulsions now shaking the world, would seem to be the prime question of the future."

The modern public school thus represents only one of the two dominant classes in English society. "Labor excluded from the public schools, has built its own schools and has set itself to destroy, not to reform, the public schools." The failure of the institutions educating the upper class youth to adjust to the social and economic conditions of the day has contributed to the widening of the gap between England's social classes. In commenting upon the failure of the public schools between 1919 and 1939 to contribute to the problems of that era, Dr. Mack states: "Though many others must share the responsibility for social and political failure, the conclusion is irresistible that, had the public school actually produced real social sympathy among its graduates, there would have been more unity in the nation and fewer men in high places willing to sacrifice Spain, Czechoslovakia, France, and possibly the empire, rather than face the possibility of social progress at home."

The English public schools will undoubtedly be affected by the present world conflict. In one of his concluding paragraphs Dr. Mack writes: "Though engaged in a death struggle with Hitler, England is at this very moment (April, 1941) literally seething with plans for the reform of the public schools . . . A solution . . . which is most in accordance with the way things have happened in the past, would be difficult to achieve, since it implies . . . a far greater readjustment than did any former reformation. It may well come

about, however, if the new spirit of national unity, created by external pressures, survives the war. For this spirit, which has temporarily replaced the warring antagonisms of right and left, could conceivably fuse the diverse and conflicting interests that have for so long made adequate reform of the public schools impossible."

The City College (New York)

EGBERT M. TURNER

An Adventure in Education: Swarthmore College under Frank Aydelotte. By the Swarthmore College Faculty. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xii, 236. \$2.50.

It is doubtful that pedagogical method makes any serious difference in higher education, provided those who are to be educated are suitably qualified and are put in the way of good books and good teachers. This is why the spectacular innovations, by which the small, obscure, or brand new college so often comes into notice, leave no impression on colleges and universities which have been earnestly and effectively at the educational task right along. If a student is prepared for college education and if his college is prepared to educate him, it will scarcely happen that questions like whether he shall live in a big house or a little one, wear clothes like the Greeks or like Americans, or read exactly a set number of books from an *Index obligatorius* will be questions of any moment. The questions that have always counted and always will count are clear, simple, and familiar. Does the college value learning above everything else? Is it the genius of the college to arouse and cultivate the young mind? Has it the zeal and resourcefulness to protect learning against the blandishments of meretricious rivals of learning?

The fitness of a college to answer in the affirmative to such questions is indeed no special merit. A business house or professional society that could not do as much, upon a corresponding trial, would hardly attain high standing. Yet the college has more reasons for being excellent than most institutions: It is greatly needed, is held in high esteem, and is provided for; its domain is the domain of truth and light; it touches the fairest and highest things; and it is free. If this seems an exaggeration, the reason is easily discovered, *viz.*, the visible colleges are too often not like

that. And if they are not, it will be interesting to see why. Indirectly, but with assurance, that may be done by considering the features of a college which is so favorably known as the one described in *An Adventure in Education*.

The occasion for the publication of this volume was the retirement of the distinguished President of Swarthmore College, Mr. Frank Aydelotte. As *primus inter pares* at Swarthmore for a period of nineteen years, Mr. Aydelotte had been the captain of the "adventure," and had all along enjoyed hearty assistance from his associates in the faculty. These desired to inscribe a memorial to him, and have done so in this form. They write anonymously, not to show the world to what lengths the academic genius can reach when it is a matter of panegyric or adoration for a superior, but, to all appearance, for the opposite purpose of giving as impersonal and soberly objective an account as possible. The unadorned facts in such an instance as this one conspire to a higher praise than the fanciest professorial periods.

Swarthmore's "adventure" (so styled with full seriousness) may be said to be principally the feat of getting youths to prefer ideas to excitement. Now this is the distinctive aim of all liberal education; so if its realization is so exceptional as to amount to an adventure, it would seem that Swarthmore College is pronouncing a very broad criticism upon other liberal colleges. No doubt she is, though in a very ingenuous, oblique way; and no doubt it was a needed criticism. A few particulars will explain.

At almost any typical American college it is regular practice to give equal standing to the subjects of study; hence we find headline writing, putting on shows, or playing the drum or piccolo, incongruously installed upon the same plane as higher mathematics, symbolic logic, or classical literature. But at Swarthmore no credit is granted for arts and crafts at all, including musical performance, painting, "creative" writing, and even English composition. Yet these are highly valued as incidentals of liberal education, and the College provides abundantly for them. At some colleges it is supposed that democratic principles require the equating of pushpin and poetry, so to speak. But one of the first principles of President Aydelotte's program was a forthright denial of this, and an assertion that education demands discrimination be-

tween better and worse, including better and worse subjects of study. Some colleges would hold that democratic principles dictate equal opportunity for all, but President Aydelotte thinks this a contradiction of the facts of human capacity, as well as a betrayal of democracy through covertly giving over the leadership not to the best qualified but to the mediocre. His conception of the democratic ideal in education is one that contemplates a matching of educational opportunity with educational capacity. Others think it is necessary to denature science, literature, and philosophy by means of the "survey" course—to such extent that a student can nowadays go through without having studied the real content of anything much; whereas at Swarthmore:—"Surely there can be no textbook to *Paradise Lost* or to Plato or even to Adam Smith or Gibbon. The way great men say things is part of their greatness, and to suppose, for example, that Gibbon in a digest, Gibbon without the Gibbonian roll and the famous footnotes and the cynicism and the glittering surface, is really Gibbon is mere blindness to what made him unique." (Page 14.) At some colleges it is a temptation, not always overcome, to believe that the more courses a department offers, the better for all concerned (provided the cost is held down). But at Swarthmore it is preferred that four or five central courses be given well, rather than a dozen or more not well. One other contrast: The great affair at most colleges, that which exerts the strongest suction on alumni and the rest, hence the occasion set apart as "homecoming"—can any reader guess what? A football game, with the familiar orgiastic accompaniments, of course. The absolute antithesis of that is the case at Swarthmore, to wit:—examination day. The students, their families, and the professors anticipate it with keenest spirits, audiences are present, and the scholars who rank highest at the end are Swarthmore's heroes. Ah, wonder of wonders! The sky is falling. Isis has come to America.

The acknowledgment of sharp differences in the capacities of students will entail, for an efficient educational system, a corresponding variety, or scaling, in the program of study. Hence the honors curriculum at Swarthmore. Under this the superior students, if they wish, may be released from the routine of courses after the second year, and for the remaining two years carry on

their work in seminar style. The honors student concentrates in two subjects each semester, taking nothing else. In each subject a seminar is held once a week. At the conclusion of two years of honors work both written and oral examinations are held upon the entire field of study. These are conducted by examiners drawn from other colleges, one of whom has written here a chapter in praise of the system. In 1939 some 42 visiting examiners gave their services (at the small cost of \$2148 to the College). Their duties comprised: preparation of one to four written examinations each (from syllabi and other materials sent to them by the Swarthmore teachers); reading ten to thirty of the examination papers; and giving oral examinations at Swarthmore for two or three days. The scheme is called "the system of external examinations." Why "external" examinations are desirable remains a question in spite of an extensive argument supporting them on the ground that they are an offset to the one-sidedness a teacher is likely to have, and are a stimulus to students. It seems President Aydelotte thought his faculty "the best in the United States." In such case it would appear a downcome, if not an impertinence, to subject the students to testing at the hands of men less distinguished. Further, an outsider is not apt to examine as exactly as the teacher himself, if the latter observes high academic standards. The outsider may be a very desirable check to shallow teaching or examining, but he cannot know the unique marks of a superior course, the manifold directions laid open, the weight of this or that datum, nor the tone and quality of the whole; for which the students are nevertheless properly accountable.

The greatest worth claimed for reforms like those at Swarthmore has been that they preserve liberal education. They are a redemption from vocationalism and superficialism. Studying the Swarthmore program, the reader may nevertheless have doubts that the narrowness and shallowness we see so much have been fully escaped. "Majors" and "minors" are here still, some four seminars in one subject ordinarily making a "major," while two apiece in a pair of additional subjects are necessary for the "minor." But sharp restrictions are set upon the range of choice, on the theory that depth or mastery can be accomplished only by concentration in contiguous subjects. So the combinations are

chemistry, physics, mathematics; zoology, chemistry, physics; economics, political science, history; English, history, philosophy; and so on, in the too familiar grooves. It would be against the law to combine fine arts, mathematics, and politics. And yet a person who learned these thoroughly would come closer to a liberal education than he who mastered almost any of the permitted combinations. Alone, chemistry, physics, and mathematics never yielded a liberal education to anybody, although one or two of them are indispensable to anything justly called liberal education. Hardly any three subjects, as these stand today, are enough to raise the mind and spirit to the pitch we mean, or once meant, by liberal education. Swarthmore is well aware of such an objection, and thinks it would lead to shallowness. We read that "the grasp of what it means to carry through a case in any field whatever, what it means to go below appearances, to appraise conflicting evidence, to guard against hasty generalization; to see the difference in a single field between the working of a first-rate mind and that of a mind that however popular is second-rate"—this insight will deeply influence what the student does in any other field. Further, Swarthmore "is committed to the view that the principles of intellectual thoroughness are in all fields the same, that once these principles have been grasped and applied, the student has a tool which he can go on to use for himself, and that the main business of a college is but to supply that tool, in as burnished a state as the metal makes possible." (Page 19.) Such premises, however, seem not to yield the conclusion adopted, that students must concentrate in two or three studies. If the "tool" is acquired in one and is usable in all, and if liberal education is the end sought, then breadth of subject matter, not narrowness, is the indicated need.

Nothing in the book suggests that Swarthmore has questioned the territorial claims of the several disciplines taught there. Although the arts and crafts were extruded, it seems that full status was retained by the conventional branches. Suppose, however, that the paring knife had been applied without, shall we say, prejudice, and those departments having, elsewhere at any rate, the most conspicuous swellings and excrescences were laid upon the operating table. Would such of them as the ones called "social sciences" come out with enough content to make up a major?

The youth possessing the epistemic tool Swarthmore tries to put in one's hands could very soon probe the entire body of social studies, exclusive of history, and when he had done so it would only be a waste for him to linger there. The same holds for a good many other academic divisions. But we must continue to wait for that college or president or faculty that will cut off the surplus (instead of grafting on more and more, save at the few Swarthmores) and come finally to see that in four years a student can indeed acquire a liberal education—can learn well not merely one or two but several of the foreign languages, can cover the richest periods of history, learn the main facts and principles and bearings of several sciences, learn something of the history of thought, and also of the arts, and make himself at home in literature, heightening all the while his power of judgment and reflection. At least half of the typical major of 25 or 30 hours in college is probably lost at present, because, in the most favored subjects, that amount is dilution or repetition and because, also, the average student reaches his saturation point after that much.

So many who direct education or who now teach are products of the pragmatic, easy-going system against which Swarthmore is a protest, and are believers in it, that it would be a mistake to suppose the Swarthmore achievement will be taken seriously, or even that its significance will be widely grasped. A vicious circle encloses an immense sector of contemporary education. From superficialism comes superficialism; *ignotum per ignotius*. This does not cease with undergraduate study but continues right on to the highest degrees given by American universities. Hence the depressing phenomenon of the doctor of philosophy who must struggle to write a passable letter, who is a stranger to whole worlds of the mind and these often the most important, who contents himself with a petty stake in some little crevice which a mind of genuine Ph.D. caliber could not possibly lodge in, and who, let's not forget, is so apt to set the intelligent layman, degreed or undegreed, to asking subtle questions behind the hand. It is because the Ph.D. degree is available on easy terms, in fields which are too slight to provide material even for a good B.S., and because, also, in a large part of the educational establishment there actually exists a spirit of hostility towards learning. For example, let anyone remark that

a university ought to restrict its work to matters having intellectual content, or that professors ought to be habituated to language and thought above the vulgar commonplaces. If this is heard by any who (1) give themselves airs as "progressivists" or who (2) are products of the laxity just noted, then the chances are that the speaker will be upbraided as being (1) academic (*sic!*), (2) a pedagogical antiquity, (3) an enemy of society, etc., etc., as long as he will listen. Hostility to learning—by which I do not mean Greek conjugations or reading Chaucer, merely—is afoot, openly at war with the whole country of the mind. When not making tank thrusts, it operates in bunds and fifth columns.

While it does not require an Aydelotte or a Hutchins to see this, it seems to require such a one to turn a hand against it. All presidents can justly be expected to do exactly that; otherwise they hardly fulfill the office they have assumed. We read that at Swarthmore, however, the president's task was, in the familiar phrase, "to release the creative energies of other men." This phrase always seems to answer less than it asks. If other men's creative energies require release, then somebody must previously have pent them up. Who was that? Not the creative spirits themselves, surely—not mathematicians, scientists, and philosophers, who have burst all bounds ever set upon them. Nor can the college president say with piety, that the Lord did it, or that mankind did. The signs of other presidents and their satellites are too obvious for that.

The presidential office is an academic anomaly, in one sense, peculiar to the United States. It is an anomaly because although the incumbent bears the title, he never can actually preside over any but peripheral, not distinctly university, matters. For who can preside or would pretend to preside over mathematics or history or poetry? (Presidents are not yet gods or muses.) Who can "administer" these but scientists and scholars? Presidents can preside over meetings, walk first in the processions, give orders to deans, see that the budget is reasonably near balance, and even fire a decubital professor now and then; but how can they preside over ideas, especially if these are ideas they themselves do not happen to have?

If they venture to preside anyhow over ideas, that moment the

silver cord is loosed. This trespass may show itself as authoritarianism in all matters—whereas there is no premise, in learning, for imperial authority; or as a check to intellectual freedom—when such freedom is the inmost nature of a mind; or as an inversion of the aims and conceptions of education such that from preferring to be, rather than to seem, education presently prefers to seem rather than to be. Behind the misuse of educational opportunity so characteristic of our system, the lamentable vulgarization, helpful to no one, and the whole onmoving eclipse of learning now so conspicuous, is to be seen the hand of this unnatural authority. By way of apology for its deeds we hear the allegation that our times are changing and that they necessitated all that has come about. Such is the justification proffered by decadence always, as though fate governed and we were helpless—"we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars; as if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion, knaves, thieves, and treachers by spherical predominance . . ." Now the contrary of this specious allegation is far nearer the truth. Nobody is clamoring to see education superficialize and cheapen itself. The desire of all is that education equip and enlighten the mind, and elevate the whole man. But that is difficult, and far easier is it to patronize men's more selfish and venal inclinations. So we have the educational *entrepreneur*, who functions under the guise of a president or dean or school superintendent—any kind of "administrator"—but who as a rule looks more like a commercial agent underneath. His leading interests seem fixed on a large volume of academic sales, continuous press notices, fans, a big "plant" (a term not very flattering to the alumni, one would think), and all the visible baggage of education. Just the things, in other words, that interest a sales manager.

Presidents are by no means alone in this materialism. A din of professors attests loyal support; for professors, too, certain ones, regard education as a business affair. It would in fact surprise if they did not go much beyond the presidents in every materializing respect, thanks to the pliability of this type and to its anxiety to please. We may even hear an occasional president give us the authority of some noted professor as justification for putting push-pin before poetry. The wonder is that more don't do this—or is it

that they don't read the pedagogues' *nova organa* or don't put any stock in them if they do?

It would be gratifying to think that only the office men of education, and not the educators, had yielded to mammonism. But no one is so untouched by life as to suppose that. We have many vast universities, within any one of which it might have been possible to establish, upon a firm base, an enclave of pure learning similar to Swarthmore. Presumably, the faculties were, and are still, against such; or they are disfranchised by administrators, including super-oligarchical boards; or else they are indifferent, caring for their jobs only. Whatever the reason, the absence of these intellectual coves from so many large universities is a telling sign of the whereabouts of the educators. We have also an impressive number and variety of academic societies among which we might fairly expect to find some that were working for ends like those to which Swarthmore is devoted. To be sure, one or two are favorable towards these ends and are fond of saying so on ceremonial occasions, and yet where is the one that has made its choice, prepared a program, and steadfastly pursued it for years, as this small college has done?

One chapter in *An Adventure in Education* (XIV) pronounces faculties incompetent in several respects, including, even, the determination of their own needs. But this is fantastic. (It was evidently written by an "administrator".) We read, "Institutions which have developed a faculty control, like the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, have tended to develop an almost irresistible force for the preservation of the academic *status quo*. Their coefficient of inertia is, for quite understandable reasons, too high to be consistent with their greatest usefulness and efficiency." (Page 205.) Even Swarthmore, it seems, has the sales-manager idea somewhere in its system. A sales manager could not understand how great universities could yield their "greatest usefulness" or show "efficiency" without new brands, new styles, and a heavy turnover from season to season. But if faculties are not qualified to determine their needs, nor to set the course of education, then who is? Office men? Or outsiders, such as comprise the supervising boards? Only when we can say that a clerk is a better chemist than a *chemist* is, or a banker a better historian than a *historian* is, can

we pay respect to the proposition that non-educators are the ones to direct education. The position of all boards and administrators, whatever their merits, is never quite free of some hint or suspicion of the interloper—and sensible board men, at least, know it. Some faculties may indeed be incompetent to direct education—but, if so, it is because they lack education, and in that case they missed their calling and are only faculties in name. A President Aydelotte is always the need when matters come to that. The pity is that there should be only one such, when we have hundreds of colleges and universities that suffer for want of his kind.

The opening essay so far excels the others in this book, and so well covers the case, that most of the remainder seems like make-weight. Not all of them, it may be observed, suggest the auctorial hand of the honors graduate, and one or two would by no means shame the literary talents of some of our most heathenish, job-centered colleges. Perhaps too many Swarthmore professors were absent, reciprocally giving “external” examinations at the time of writing, and have not exhibited their genius here.

Louisiana State University

PETER A. CARMICHAEL

Publications Received

The American Idea, by Eugene T. Adams, *et al.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942. Pp. 278.

American Universities and Colleges That Have Held Broadcast License, by Carroll Atkinson. Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1941. Pp. 127. \$1.50.

Bethany Years, by W. K. Woolery. Huntington, West Virginia: Standard Printing and Publishing Company, 1941. Pp. 290. \$3.00.

College and University Museums, by Laurence Vail Coleman. Washington: The American Association of Museums, 1942. Pp. 73. \$1.25.

Democracy's College, The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage, by Earle D. Ross. Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1942. Pp. 267. \$3.00.

The Development of University Centers in the South, edited with an introduction by A. F. Kuhlman. Nashville: The Peabody Press and The Vanderbilt University Press, 1942. Pp. 128.

Educational Leadership in This Emergency, by William G. Carr. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1942. Pp. 32. \$1.00.

Educational Motion Pictures and Libraries, by Gerald Doan McDonald. Chicago: The American Library Association, 1942. Pp. 183. \$2.75.

Emergent Conceptions of the School Administrator's Task, by Harold Benjamin. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1942. Pp. 26. \$1.00.

Employment Problems of College Students, by Samuel Clayton Newman. Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942. Pp. 158. \$2.50.

Higher Education and the War, edited by Clarence Stephen Marsh. Washington: American Council on Education Studies, 1942. Pp. 184. \$1.00.

Language Habits in Human Affairs, by Irving J. Lee. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. Pp. 278. \$1.25.

A New Earth and a New Humanity, by Oliver L. Reiser. New York: Creative Age Press, Inc., 1942. Pp. 252. \$2.50.

The Organization of Knowledge, by Glenn Negley. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1942. Pp. 373. \$3.00, school ed.

Print, Radio and Film in a Democracy, edited with an introduction by Douglas Waples. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. 197. \$2.00.

Radio Extension Courses Broadcast for Credit, by Carroll Atkinson. Boston: Meador Publishing Company, 1941. Pp. 128. \$1.50.

Youth and the Future, The General Report of the American Youth Commission. Washington: American Council on Education, 1942. Pp. 296. \$2.50.

COMMENTS ON "XENOGLOTTOPHOBIA"

The article, "Xenoglottophobia," by Professor Robert Withington of Smith College, which was published in the December, 1941 *Bulletin*, has stimulated helpful discussion of this pertinent subject. Some of the comments brought to the attention of the Editor are published below. The article has been reprinted by the American Association of Teachers of German in the March issue of *The German Quarterly* and is to be published in the *Bulletin* of the New England Modern Language Association.

THE EDITOR

An Editorial, entitled "Xenoglottophobia—New Name for an Old War-Time Malady," published in the January 1 issue of the COLUMBUS (Ohio) EVENING DISPATCH:

We don't want to scare anybody, but we've just learned that a malady—highly contagious, too—that spread all over the country in the last war is likely to get started again most any time. It's xenoglottophobia and just in case this word isn't right in the top drawer of our readers' vocabularies, we hasten to explain that it simply means a fear of the enemy's language.

We found this impressive label doing duty as the title of an article by Robert Withington of Smith College in the latest *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors. The good professor has written himself a piece in which he attacks the folly of fighting a mother tongue simply because one is on the outs with the country where it is spoken. This analysis is comprehensive and deserves wider reading than it is likely to get in its original publication.

He makes a good practical point when he writes:

If the study of foreign languages ever produced valuable disciplines, it will continue to produce these disciplines regardless of the position in which we may find ourselves a month or a year hence.

The practical advantages derived from a knowledge of another language may even be increased—particularly if we are called upon to bargain. A polyglot has an obvious advantage over a monoglot

in such a situation: for he can speak the other fellow's language when the other cannot speak his; and it is more important to know the language of our enemies than that of our friends.

Music, gold, and friendship express themselves in a universal tongue: true amity always makes itself understood—often without words; but when enemies meet, those who have to use an interpreter are at a disadvantage.

The monoglot cannot judge the accuracy of the interpreter's translations, which he must trust absolutely; he cannot gauge the spirit of his antagonist's statements; he communicates as it were at second-hand. We are glad to appreciate the beauties of a Heine in the original; from a practical standpoint, we should insist on knowing what a von Ribbentrop actually says. . . . Just as one who speaks German need not be a Nazi, so one can be a Nazi without speaking German.

When foreign language groups preach totalitarian doctrines in English, they can be taken care of; it is the doctrines that count, not the language. One can wave a swastika in any tongue. One can recite a German poem—as one can drink Lowenbrauer or Hochheimer—without endorsing Hitler's political philosophy. The Germans play Shakespeare on their stages with no thought of Churchill; the Russians become absurd when they distort Hamlet to support Bolshevik dogma.

Going into the philosophical arguments against the practice of xenoglottophobia—we like that word—he says with reason that it is the idea expressed in a language that counts, not the language itself and goes on to point out the obvious truth that people generally are more discriminating and informed than they were a quarter-century ago:

We are surely aware that when a foreigner talks to us in English he does not identify himself with the New Deal, or even with a belief in democracy as the ideal form of government. We know that the Germans who speak English are not accused of sympathy with Churchill or Roosevelt, and that the people have been encouraged to assume this eminently practical discipline. We know that many refugees are in America because they do not support the dictators at home; we are pleased to give them refuge.

Perhaps we excuse ourselves by holding that no real scientific or literary work of value can emerge from a totalitarian state, or from government-controlled universities. If we do, we forget that much important work was produced before Duce or Fuehrer

undertook to lead the march of regress. Should our communities become more isolationist in this matter of language-teaching (glottodoxy), the teachers must show them the error of their ways; and the disturbed international situation should spur, instead of curb, foreign-language teaching (xenoglottodoxy), without weakening our institutions.

Let us by all means learn the language of our friends, and so cement the friendship; but let us by no means neglect the language of our enemies, that we may understand them, and meet them more than half-way, either around the council table, or (if it becomes necessary) on the field. Knowledge leads to wisdom—and wisdom is strength.

Professor Adolphe J. Dickman of The University of Wyoming:

I read the article "Xenoglottophobia" with great pleasure and have asked the Editors of the *French Review* and the *Modern Language Journal* to have the article quoted at length. In fact if I were editor I would have it *in toto*.

I have also called the article to the attention of some of my colleagues here at Wyoming.

Professor E. F. Engel of The University of Kansas:

As a veteran university teacher of German who has passed through one crushing retreat in his field because of World War I and who is now witnessing another less violent perhaps but all the more ominous offensive against the teaching of foreign languages because of the more crucial World War II, I want to commend the publication of the article on "Xenoglottophobia" by Professor Withington of Smith College in the December number of the *Bulletin*.

Being a teacher of English, Professor Withington is able to discuss his subject from an objective, unbiased point of view which puts a premium upon his interesting and convincing arguments for the study and knowledge of foreign languages. His analysis of the fear and antagonism to foreign languages in time of war is true and sound, namely, that an irrational, indiscriminating public identifies the reading and speaking of the language of the enemy with sympathy and approval of the aims and acts of the enemy and as grounds for suspicion of disloyalty to our own

government. He points out, by implication at least, that the language and literature of a nation must be evaluated apart from any transient political or military eruption in that nation.

We cannot, of course, completely detach the language and literature of a nation from its ethnological status in the world and one may speculate on what will happen to the languages of the belligerent nations in this cataclysmic war if they win or lose. But whatever the outcome there will be just as many foreign languages even though the relative importance of their contributions to the thought and literature of the world may change. It is certain that there will be greatly accelerated intercourse among the nations of the world and it will be increasingly necessary that truly educated and progressive people learn to know the people of other nations through their native languages. The capacity of the human mind and heart for words, thoughts, and emotions is so great that no one language can supply them all and the wider our acquaintance with foreign languages the richer our mental and spiritual possessions become.

Professor Hans Kohn of Smith College:

I read Professor Withington's article on "Xenoglottophobia" in your last issue. I enjoyed not only the style of his communication, but also his fight against one of the most insidious enemies of democracy and peace, Xenophobia. I certainly hope that similar spirited articles will appear from time to time on your pages.

Professor William Charles Korfmacher of Saint Louis University:

All readers of the *Bulletin* should feel themselves very deeply indebted to Professor Robert Withington of Smith College for his splendid article on "Xenoglottophobia" in the December, 1941 number. It is as timely as the latest bulletin on World War II and as sane as a simple theorem in geometry. It makes the very fundamental distinction between emotionalism and good sense, between hysteria and right reason, in the efforts of the nation during these present troubled days.

There is a real danger—even now realized to some extent, I am

afraid, in some schools—that the foreign languages, especially German, Italian, and French, will decline because of the alignment and sympathies of the countries of their origin in the present conflict. The briefest reflection will show how shortsighted such a movement is. For a knowledge or study of the language of an enemy cannot possibly be twisted into an expression of sympathy for the enemy. One can even imagine a certain satisfaction on the part of the foe if we thus blindly deprive ourselves of the cultural and commercial values of his particular tongue. In much the same way, I suspect, Nippon regards with pleased satisfaction the widespread attitude to Japanese-made goods that were here before hostilities began and have been, presumably, paid for in good American dollars or American exchange. It is understandable, of course, that Americans should encounter with annoyance the “made in Japan” label. And yet to destroy such goods that are already here is really to be wasteful when we are being urged to save and so is equivalent to aiding the foe instead of harming him.

Again, the briefest reflection will make quite clear that the better we know the languages of our enemies, the more completely we comprehend their ways of life, their past and current histories, their national ideals and aspirations, the better we shall be able to carry on a successful war against them. There is thus for the time being a positive utilitarian reason for active work in certain of the foreign languages, at least. And if we are interested in arriving at an estimate of our enemies’ mentalities and ways of thought, there is hardly a readier means of our so doing than by a thorough study of their languages. For language, after all, is but spoken thought and emotion and imagination; it is a ready key to many phases of a people’s characteristic psychology.

I have spoken of “reflection,” but that activity is, to be sure, all too likely to be swept aside in the enthusiastic dash of all-out war effort. Yet it is to the utmost advantage of the nation that at least certain large groups should keep their heads in the crisis. There are few groups of which such balance and sanity can be more reasonably expected than from the collegiate and university faculties of America. We shall be derelict in one of our highest duties if, as a body, we fail.

And so it is refreshing and cheering to read Professor Withington's tempered article. Let us keep the languages in their place, and even enlarge that place. And let us not forget the claims of the ancient classical languages as well as the modern foreign tongues. They have their help to offer towards the successful consummation of the present conflict; and they, as well as all the tradition of training in the humanities, may well look to a share in the difficult years of peace and reconstruction that lie ahead.

Professor Thurlow C. Nelson of Rutgers University:

Three cheers for the article on "Xenoglottophobia" in the December A. A. U. P. *Bulletin*; it is simply swell!

Would that every trustee and university administrator in America might read it. I shall do my best to see that some of ours do.

With many thanks for furnishing me with a glorious quarter of an hour.

Professor George M. Priest of Princeton University:

Allow me to express my pleasure in reading the article in the last number of the publications of the American Association of University Professors and my earnest approval of the points made by the author. If I differ with him at all, it would be only in such trivial cases I should be reluctant to mention my differences. I may only say that the article leaves me with the impression that the author has a good deal more to say along that line, and if he has, I would urge him to proceed and say it all.

Contributors

WENDELL BERGE is Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

PETER A. CARMICHAEL is Professor of Philosophy at Louisiana State University.

CHARLES FAIRMAN is Associate Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. While a member of the Williams College faculty, he was chapter secretary in 1932-1933 and chapter president in 1936.

ERNEST V. HOLLIS is a member of the staff of the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council of Education.

BURGES JOHNSON is Professor of English and Chairman of the Department at Union College.

RAINARD B. ROBBINS is Vice-President and Secretary of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

DR SCOTT is Professor of Accounting and Statistics at the University of Missouri. He was chapter president in 1932-1933, and served as a member of the Council in 1937-1939. He has been a member of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure since 1938.

LAURENS H. SEELYE is Assistant to the Chairman of The Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars of the Institute of International Education.

JOHN B. ST. JOHN is Chief of the Actuarial Section of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

EGBERT M. TURNER is Associate Professor of Education at The City College in New York.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admission of Members following nomination by one Active Member of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election cannot take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

(a) *Active*. To become an Active Member, it is necessary to hold a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate Members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus*. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership. Emeritus members pay no dues but may if they desire receive the *Bulletin*, at \$1.00 a year.

(e) *Life Membership*. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active, Junior, and Associate

Members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Nominations for Membership

The following 197 nominations for Active membership and 7 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

Adelphi College, Marion Y. Ostrander; University of Alabama, Edward H. Anderson, Oscar Dahlene, Edward Foster, Arnold Powell, Jerome W. Schweitzer; University of Arkansas (Medical School), Benjamin B. Wells; Atlanta University, Hugh Gloster; Ball State Teachers College, Esther J. Swenson; Baylor University, Merle M. McClellan; Beloit College, Arthur M. Coon; Billings Polytechnic Institute, Herbert Klindt; Bowdoin College, Samuel E. Kamerling; Bowling Green State University, Herschel Litherland; Butler University, J. Russell Townsend, Jr.; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Clara E. Miller; University of Cincinnati, George Rieveschl, Jr., Josephine Swift; The City College (New York), Abraham Mazur, Sidney I. Pomerantz; University of Colorado, William W. Longley; Teachers College of Connecticut, R. Heber Richards; University of Dayton, Allan McI. O'Leary; De Paul University, Leo Shapiro; Florida State College for Women, Barbara Morehead; Franklin College of Indiana, Ethelwyn Miller; Georgia School of Technology, Andi Schiltz; Green Mountain Junior College, Clarence E. Akerstrom; Harris Teachers College, Gertrude J. Bishop, Helen L. Graves, Theodore H. Leon, Marie A. Moore, Sol E. Margolin, John R. Powell, Grace R. Shetterly,

Elizabeth Toomey; Hobart College, Stuart Jamieson; Huron College, Noble C. Gantvoort, Ruth Koerber, Leo Spurrier; Southern Illinois Normal University, Frances Rowe, Jesse E. Young; Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Gertrude Hendrix; Western Illinois State Teachers College, Clifford A. Julstrom; Indiana State Teachers College, Walter E. Marks; Indiana University, Horst Frenz, Francis E. McIntyre, Frances Orgain; Iowa State College, Eugene H. Wilson; Juniata College, Kathleen Burnett; Kansas State College, Alfred T. Perkins, John C. Peterson; Fort Hays Kansas State College, David M. Cole, Donald M. Johnson; Lawrence College, Frank E. Fischer, Henry F. May, Jr., David H. Owen; Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Archie C. Thomas; Louisiana State University, James W. DeVault, Donald H. Morrison; MacMurray College for Women, Herbert Philippi; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Daniel C. Walsh; Marquette University, Paul Noelke; Mary Washington College, James H. Dodd, Richard M. Kirby; Western Maryland College, Marion R. Bartlett; University of Maryland, Millard Barton, C. A. Hogentogler, Charles A. Shreeve, Jr., J. Marvin Sipe; Memphis State College, William G. Deen; University of Michigan, Joshua McClennen; Mills College, Alfred Neumeyer; Monmouth College, Glenn E. Robinson, Robert G. Woll, Margaret Woodbridge; Mt. Holyoke College, Dana B. Durand; Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney), Gail Powell; New Jersey State Teachers College (Montclair), Howard F. Fehr; New Mexico State College, Wilbur H. Goss, Marion A. Hardman, A. M. Lukens, Oliver E. McAdams, G. William Schneider, John M. Swarthout; East Carolina Teachers College (North Carolina), Beecher Flanagan, Herbert ReBarker; Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Elisabeth Jastrow; Northwestern University, Ira O. Anderson, Royal G. Bigelow, Elizabeth Burgett, Robert L. Champion, Harold A. Graver, Richard S. Hartenberg, Harry D. Kerrigan, Wilbert Seidel; Norwich University, Ralph C. Taylor; Notre Dame College, Mary Jane Manning; Ohio University, Carl J. House, Floyd L. James, Frederic Picard; Ohio Wesleyan University, Hastings Bells, Sigfred C. Matson, Guy W. Sarvis; Eastern Oregon College of Education, Ralph E. Badgley, Edith B. Darby, Joseph Gaiser, Alvin Kaiser, Arta F. Lawrence, Albert V. Logan, John M. Miller, Betty E. Molgard, Floyd Orton, Charles Quaintance, Kenneth E. Schilling, Amanda Zabel; Pennsylvania State College, Kent Forster, Kenneth D. Hutchinson, Mary Jane Wyland; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville), Lee E. Boyer, Dean Dutcher, Justus M. Hull, Lynwood S. Lingenfelter, Sanders P. McComsey, C. Maxwell Myers, Milton Steinhauer, Mark E. Stine; University of Pennsylvania, George A. MacFarland, Ralph C. Preston; University of Pittsburgh, H. H. Green, Herbert Longenecker, Herbert Olander; Princeton University, Samuel B. Bossard, Jeremiah S. Finch, Asher E. Hinds, Robert H. Super; Queens College (New York), Robert H. Ball, Arthur L. Colwin, T. Freeman Cope, Henry David, Jacques G. C. Le Clercq, David G. Powers, University of Redlands, Earl Cranston, Alton A. Lindsey, Gerard F. W. Mulders; Reed College, Lloyd Reynolds; Russell Sage College, H. Marcelle Henry; St.

Francis College, Nicholas Schanck; St. Lawrence University, George Brown, Donald Emblen, John R. Mashek, Olive Parmenter; St. Louis University, Frederic L. Jones, Herbert M. McLuhan, Marshall Smelser; San Diego State College, John E. Firman, E. Hunter Mead; San Francisco State College, Ruth Lyon, Edla Walter; Smith College, Walter Gieseke, Jean F. Mitchell; Sul Ross State Teachers College, A. J. Parkhurst; Syracuse University, Allen P. Cowgill; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Floyd B. Clark, Arvy F. Ligon; Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Harold G. Burman; University of Texas, Gibson Danes; Tulane University, Anna Jane Harrison; University of Utah, G. Victor Beard, Henry H. Frost, Jr., Don M. Rees, Charles P. Schleicher; University of Vermont, Ippocrates Pappoutsakis; Wabash College, Lloyd B. Howell; Washington and Jefferson College, George W. Bennett; Central Washington College of Education, Paul E. Blackwood, Wayne S. Hertz; State College of Washington, Hilton P. Goss; University of Washington, Clara A. Storvick; Wayne University, Henry H. Pixley, Emery Troxel; Wellesley College, Katy B. George; Western College, M. D. Jeremy Ingalls; Western Reserve University, J. Paul Quigley; Wheaton College (Massachusetts), Jane L. Chidsey; College of William and Mary, Daniel J. Blocker, Wayne F. Gibbs, John R. L. Johnson, Harold R. Phalen, Bruce T. McCully, Thomas Thorne; Williams College, William M. Gibson, Clay Hunt, Colin C. Reid, R. Jack Smith; Wisconsin State Teachers College (Oshkosh), Robert G. Neumann; Xavier University, Alvin H. Jones.

Junior

Louisiana State University, Dorothy George; University of Missouri, Wainwright D. Blake; Northwestern University, Sol Garfield, Harlan L. Hagman, Armand L. Hunter, William D. Lucas; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Cecil Smith (M.A., Ohio State University), Pratt, Kans.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 284 Active and 8 Junior Members as follows:

Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, John W. Scott; University of Alabama, James M. Faircloth, Martin B. Williams; University of Arkansas, John Totter; Baldwin-Wallace College, Mildred Denniston; Ball State Teachers College, Ethelyn Davidson; Bates College, William D. Sutcliffe, Robert A. Winters; Baylor University, Paul Gelrud; Bennett Junior College, Esther P. Burnett, Philip M. Burnett, Malvina Ehrlich, Vera J. Fehr, Rosemary Gannon, Sarah V. Hodges, Melita Hofmann, Mary Hufham, Dorothy Matthews, Clara M. Murphy, Harris K. Prior, Carmen Rooker; Bowling Green State University, Freda Bruns, John Bunn, Jesse J. Currier, Norman Eggimann, Irene C. Mooers, B. L. Pierce, Margaret A. Purdy, Bertha K. Robertson;

Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Beatrice Benson, M. Gertrude Harvey; University of British Columbia, W. J. Brockelbank; Bucknell University Junior College, Virginia L. Brown, Mary L. Green, J. Carrell Morris, Guenter G. Schmalz; Butler University, Donald D. Burchard, L. Gray Burdin, Margaret T. Fisher, Frank Hedden, Maria W. Hyde, Charles C. Josey, Charles Kinter, Nancy Moore, William J. Moore, Louise M. Schulmeyer, Charles H. Walters; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Martin Chworowsky, E. Lyle Owen, James F. Reed; Case School of Applied Science, Edwin L. Crow; Centenary College of Louisiana, Betty Lawrence, Bruno Strauss, Robert C. Topper; University of Cincinnati, Ira D. Wollermann; The Citadel, Samuel Wilcox; The City College (New York) David F. Strong; The City College (Commerce Center), Robert E. Henderson; University of Colorado, Edna Willis; Cornell College, William L. Dunn; University of Dayton, Jerome H. Gibson, Kenneth C. Schraut, Barth J. Snyder; University of Detroit, James J. Jelinek; Duke University, Arthur B. Ferguson, Fritz London; Emory University, Tommie Dora Barker; Evansville College, J. Frederick Doering, Donald Dunham, Fritz C. Neumann; Florida State College for Women, Herbert L. Hackett; University of Florida, George G. Fox, Sigismond deR. Diettrich; Fordham University (Manhattan), Edward L. Curran; Fresno State College, John J. Harton; George Washington University, Charles E. Cook, Lea G. Gramling, Frederick Hellman, John W. Wrench, Jr.; Georgia School of Technology, Lane Mitchell; Georgia State Woman's College, Mary Longley; Gettysburg College, George A. Kromhaut, William F. Quillian, Jr., William T. Starr; Goucher College, Dorothea E. Wyatt; Grinnell College, James A. Adams, Joseph F. Becker, Grace Hunter, Frances Mussey, Walter J. Schnerr, Dwight L. Wennersten; University of Hawaii, Florence M. Henderson; Hobart College, Frances S. Miller, Oswald Rossi; Hofstra College, Stanley E. Rodgers, Jr.; Illinois Institute of Technology, Herbert Bernstein, Marie E. Blanks, John W. Calkin, Mollie Cohen, M. Alden Countryman, Marcel W. Fodor, Billy E. Goetz, Hugh J. McDonald, Anna C. Orcutt, Hans Reissner, John H. Smale, Helen L. Stevens, James S. Thompson, Ernest T. Walker; Southern Illinois Normal University, Robert W. English; Indiana University, Harry G. Day, Edwin N. Kime; Iowa State College, Florence Fallgatter, Bryce Ryan, Pearl Swanson; State University of Iowa, William A. Anderson, A. K. Miller; Iowa Wesleyan College, Charles J. Kennedy; Johns Hopkins University, Donald M. Pace; Kalamazoo College, Luike J. Hemmes; Kansas State College, Donald Wilbur; University of Kansas, Tom D. Jones; Kent State University, Norvin Carter; Lafayette College, Harold W. Streeter; Lake Erie College, Clarence Shute, Gladys Wardwell; Lake Forest College, Arthur Voss; Lincoln Memorial University, Leonard R. Morey; Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Sudie Carroll; Louisiana State Normal College, Grace W. Stark; Louisiana State University, Peter Graffagnino, Adrian Kammeraad; University of Louisville, John A. Straw; Madison College, Anson B. Barber, Joseph Brown; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, William Harms, William Walsh; Mary Washington College, William L. McDermott; Western Maryland College,

Richard P. Metcalf, Jackson P. Sickels; **University of Maryland**, A. Wiley Sherwood; **Michigan State College**, Ira B. Baccus, Helen Baeder, Evalyn Bergstrand, Wilda Bolles, Paula Dressel, Duane Gibson, William A. Kelly, James Miller, Paul Morrison, James E. Powell, Joseph W. Sheedy, John F. Thaden, George B. Van Schaack, Charles P. Wells, Everett T. Welmers; **Western Michigan College of Education**, David C. Shilling; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Hazel E. Carter, William W. Cook, Robert L. Main, John Rudin, W. Glenn Ruff, Maxine Williams; **University of Missouri**, Charles C. Center, Walter D. Keller; **Monmouth College**, Marion Burgess, Edna B. Riggs; **Montana State University**, Francis E. Coad, Clifton E. Harper, Donald M. Hetler, Ralph McGinnis, Daniel Q. Posin, Flora B. Weisberg, Philip Wright; **Mount Holyoke College**, Lillian M. Bean, Mary F. Williams; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Gavin Doughty; **University of Nebraska**, Donald A. Lentz, Theodore F. Marburg; **Nebraska Wesleyan University**, Gilbert Smith; **University of Nevada**, Eldon Wittwer; **University of New Mexico**, Parry A. Reiche; **New York University**, Egbert H. van Delden; **Occidental College**, Elizabeth J. McCloy, George M. McCune; **Ohio State University**, Frank E. Hamilton; **University of Oregon**, Rex Underwood; **Pennsylvania State College**, M. Nelson McGeary, Everard M. Williams; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (California)**, Leon Connell, C. Mart Hughey; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Edinboro)**, Hazel M. Ketcham; **University of Pittsburgh**, Paul A. Brown; **University of Puerto Rico**, Marcel Weinreich; **Purdue University**, Loy E. Davis, William H. Headlee, Eldon Jerome; **Queen's University**, Robert A. Chipman; **Rollins College**, William L. Hutchings; **Russell Sage College**, Louise Foering, Paul L. Ward, Elinor Ware; **St. Lawrence University**, Madeleine Lelievre; **San Francisco State College**, John Gutmann; **Sioux Falls College**, John K. Edwards; **Southern Methodist University**, William H. Lichte, Roy W. McDonald; **Syracuse University**, Benjamin P. Atkinson, F. Montague Charman, Dorothy Drew, Milo Henke, Thelma E. Huff, Richard Wedderspoon; **Talladega College**, James O. Hopson; **Temple University**, Warren M. Ballard, John C. Pflaum, Thomas D. McCormack; **University of Tennessee**, Rulin Bruesch, Robert W. Richey; **Texas Christian University**, Cleatice L. Littlefield; **North Texas State Teachers College**, Henry G. Shands; **Southwest Texas State Teachers College**, Don C. Streeter; **University of Texas**, Paul Brindley, George W. N. Eggers, John J. Lawless, Joseph T. Roberts; **Trinity College**, Maurice E. Bates, Clarence E. Watters; **Tufts College**, Richard S. Beal, Donald Brodine, Herman R. Sweet, Raymond L. Walkley; **Tulane University**, Elizabeth W. Barnett, Nicholas J. Demerath, Lena E. Grimes, Gladys E. Hall; **United States Naval Academy**, Douglas R. Lacey, A. Stuart Pitt, Seymour Sherman; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Marion L. Nielsen, Alice Senob, Charles J. Sorenson; **Virginia State Teachers College (Farmville)**, Virginia E. Bedford, Mary P. Nichols; **University of Virginia**, Francis G. Lankford; **Wagner Memorial Lutheran College**, Leonard Brabec; **Washburn Municipal University**, Howard Church, Ira Pratt; **Central Washington College of Education**, Burt M. Ketric;

State College of Washington, Clifford L. Bedford, Lucile Dauner, Virginia Landquist, V. A. Leonard, Herman Mason; Wellesley College, Katherine C. Balderston; Wesleyan University, Charles L. Christ, Ross A. Gortner, Jr., Alan B. Overstreet; Western College, Gabriele von M. Brezina; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Frank M. Brettholle; Whitman College, M. Duane Bown, Paul J. Jackson; Whitworth College, Mary Boppell, Albert Culverwell, Ernestine Evans, Ruth F. Large, Helen Magill, Merton D. Munn; College of William and Mary, Samuel J. McCoy; Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse), Maurice O. Graff; University of Wisconsin, Helen L. Allen, Gustav Bohstedt, Wilford J. Brogden, Alfred Galpin, George W. Keitt, William H. McShan, Gordon N. Mackenzie, Paul L. Trump, Harold R. Wolfe; University of Wyoming, Gilmore Aarestad, Robert Becker, Harold Kane, Everett D. Lantz, Randell D. Watkins.

Transfers from Junior to Active

University of Maryland, Cecil Ball; New Mexico State College, Roy MacKay; Northwestern University, William C. Henry.

Junior

Baylor University, Clara Duggin; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Henry Posner, Jr.; Iowa State College, Russell E. Carr; Wheaton College, Margaret E. Ames; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Ernest M. Hall (Ph.D., University of Illinois), Evanston, Ill.; Jacob I. Hartstein (M.A., Columbia University), New York, N. Y.; José D. Masters (Graduate work, Ohio State University), Shawnee, Okla.; Frances V. Peck (Graduate work, Catholic University), New Windsor, Md.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

The Association is glad to render service to appointing officers and teachers by publishing the information below. The officers of the Association can, however, take no responsibility for maintaining a register or for making a selection among applicants. It is optional with the appointing officer or the applicant to publish the address in the announcement or to use a key number. In the latter case those interested should send their letters of application to the General Secretary, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Teachers Available

Biology: Woman, Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1922, desires position teaching zoology, physiology, anatomy, genetics, botany, or bacteriology. Successful experience in university and college teaching. Available June 1, 1942. A 1969

Biology, Zoology: Man, 46, married, Ph.D. 21 years' teaching experience in college and university departments. Research in freshwater fisheries. Now successfully employed. Desires change where opportunity offers early chance for headship of department. Phi Kappa Phi, Sigma Xi. A 1970

Chemistry: Physical chemist, Ph.D., with teaching experience in inorganic chemistry and research in insecticides and fertilizers, publications and patents, desires teaching or research position. A 1971

Chemistry and Modern Languages: Man, 56, A.E., M.A., Ph.D., Sigma Xi. Teaching and research in leading colleges. Retired 1938. Wishes to return to teaching or administrative activity for duration. A 1972

Consumption, theory, principles, social reforms: Man, 40, married, Ph.D. Illinois. 10 years of college teaching; 7 years of industrial experience and one year of social work. Employed, but desires change to college or university offering greater academic and financial opportunities, preferably north central or east. Available June or September. A 1973

Economics: Man, 37, married. Ph.D. Desires change from present position. Travelled and studied abroad extensively. Research. Publications. Executive and business experience. Trained also to teach work in related social sciences. A 1974

Economics and Sociology: Man, Ph.D.; considerable experience teaching in both fields. Now employed, but desires change. A 1975

Education and Political Science: Man, married, 42, Ph.D. 8 years of college and university teaching here and abroad plus many years of research work. Publications. Widely travelled; linguist. Excellent recommendations. Special interests: intellectual defense and national morale courses (see *School and Society*, March 14), contemporary civilization surveys, social philosophies, history of education and culture. K. L. London, 304 W. 104th St., New York City. Tel. AC 2-0736.

English: Man, 38; Ph.D., University of Virginia. 12 years' teaching in college and university. Recommendations. Available June or September. A 1977

English: Man, Ph.D., married. 21 years' university teaching. Nineteenth Century specialization, with courses in Contemporary Literature and World Classics. Extensive foreign travel, studies abroad, research publications, and a volume of poetry. Desires change: professorship, with or without administrative responsibilities. A 1978

English: Man, 36, married, Ph.D. 1941. 12 years' successful teaching in college and university. Available June 1, 1942. A 1979

English: Woman, 28, single, some work towards Ph.D. Now in sixth year as instructor at state university. Publications. Phi Beta Kappa. Desires summer teaching, tutoring, literary or clerical work. Available June 1. A 1980

English, Classics, General Literature: Man, single; Ph.D., Chicago. Protestant. 20 years' experience in teaching, research, administrative work. Foreign travel, publications. Seeks better location where scholarship, publication, teaching ability, and administrative capacity will be valued. Interested in a summer teaching post for next season. A 1981

English, Comparative Philology: Man, 35, married, A.M. in English (Harvard), Ph.D. in comparative philology (June, 1942). 10 years of university teaching. Employed; available June, 1942. Excellent recommendations. A 1982

French: Man, single, 47, French State Doctorate, Dupin aîné prizeman for the best thesis of the year 1934-1935. Author 2 books in French. 8 years' residence in France. 10 years' university teaching experience in other subjects. Available June 1. A 1983

French, German: Woman, Docteur d'Université. High school and college experience. Now employed, but desires better position. A 1984

French, German, Russian, Spanish: Man, 51; naturalized citizen since 1928. Specializing in practical phonetics. Studies abroad: Universities of Berlin, Paris, Moscow, Mexico City. Ph.D., Chicago. Close to 20 years of teaching in college and university. Publications in English and foreign languages. Now employed in an Eastern college, desires change. Available for June or September. A 1985

French, German, Spanish: Man, 38, single. Quebec Provincial Scholar in Europe 1928-1931. Doctorate. Extensive foreign travel. Publications. 10 years' teaching experience in college. Desires change. Available June or September. Also interested in summer employment. (Experienced violinist, can also coach tennis.) (U. S. citizen.)

A 1986

French, Italian, Spanish: Man, married. M.A., part of work for doctorate. 15 years' teaching experience, 8 in college. Speaking knowledge, all three languages; foreign study and travel; now employed.

A 1987

French, Spanish: Man, 39, French born. Some graduate work at Columbia University and at the Universidad Nacional de México. Ph.D. University of Paris, Sorbonne 1936. 17 years' teaching experience, 12 years as professor of French and Spanish languages and literatures in an Eastern university. Travelled extensively abroad and in North America. Publications. References. Available June or September, 1942.

A 1988

German: Man, unmarried. Long experience in college teaching and extensive travel and study abroad. Much interested in teaching of scientific and military German. Employed but available for summer session.

A 1989

German: Man, 46, single, American ancestry, A.B., A.M., Ph.D. Phi Beta Kappa. Study abroad, successful teaching experience, research achieved and in progress. Position ending at end of present year because of retrenchment and seniority rights of other members of staff, but excellent recommendations. Quite interested in tutorial or honors systems; also in library activities.

A 1990

German, French: Man, Ph.D., Berlin. Naturalized citizen. 14 years' experience in undergraduate and graduate teaching and some administrative work at leading American university. Publications. 6 years' consultant for PMLA. Now employed. Also interested in summer appointment. Excellent recommendations.

A 1991

German, French: Man, Ph.D., Bonn. Naturalized citizen. 14 years' experience in language teaching in college and university. Perfect speaking knowledge of German and French. Extensive travel and residence in Germany and France. Thorough mastery of English. Desires change. Available in June or September. Best recommendations.

A 1992

German, French, History of Civilization: Man, married, 47. Naturalized citizen. Ph.D. Goettingen. Experience: 17 years chairman German Department, American college; 4 years P. G. School, Navy; lecture courses abroad. Publications in German and English. Change due to altered curriculum. Best American references. Available now.

A 1993

Italian, French, Spanish, German, Classical Languages: Man, 42, married. Ph.D. Former European university teacher. American experience.

A 1994

Italian and Spanish or Italian and French: Man, 43, married. Ph.D. Former lecturer of famous European universities. American college experience.

A 1995

Languages and Comparative Literature: Man, 33, family. Ph.D. 9 years' college experience, including teaching of elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses in French, German, Latin, Spanish, Italian, Greek, and Russian languages and literatures. Also qualified in Portuguese and Scandinavian languages. 3 years' high school experience as department head. Publications. Now employed, 8 years with present institution. Desires associate professorship in excellent university or headship of language department in excellent college. Phi Beta Kappa, valedictorian of college class. Live wire teacher. Excellent recommendations. A 1996

Personnel: A.M. Harvard and Columbia, guidance training; Y.W.-C.A. experience. References. A 1997

Physical Science Survey and Physics: Man, 38, Ph.D. in Physics. 10 years' experience college teaching in above fields. During last 5 years, director of natural science orientation course with annual enrollment of over 300. One book. Now employed but would be interested in position offering greater opportunities in survey field. Available for summer work. A 1998

Psychology, Education: Man, Ph.D., Indiana. Graduate study, Columbia and University of Chicago. Successful college and university teaching experience in psychology, education, philosophy and sociology. Now employed. Excellent references. Available June or September. A 1999

Psychology and Education, either one or both: Man, married, Ph.D. 18 years' experience in college teaching. Has had variety of other experience as well as teaching in several different fields. A 2000

Russian Language, History and Literature: Man, single, Ph.D. Columbia University. Teaching and research experience, references, publications. A 2001

Sociology: Man, married, Ph.D., Phi Beta Kappa. Extensive experience—teaching, travel, research. Vitrally interested in students. Now teaching, desires different location. A 2002

Sociology, Political Science, Social Philosophy: Man, 44, single. Ph.D. University of Leipzig, 1922. Naturalized citizen. Employed in Midwest college but desires change. Publications in German and English. Extensive speaking engagements. Background of teaching, research, foreign administration and political service. Excellent recommendations. A 2003

Spanish, French, German: Man, early forties, married. Ph.D. Teaching experience in American colleges and European universities. A 2004

Spanish, French, Italian; Administration; General Humanities: Woman, single. A.M., Ph.D., Phi Beta Kappa. Various scholarships and fellowships in leading universities in United States and abroad. Successful undergraduate and graduate teaching experience in college and university with both segregated and mixed classes. Administrative experience. Research. Many successful publications. Extensive travel, United States and abroad. Numerous excellent references from chairmen in leading universities. Interested in summer or regular session appointment. A 2005

Zoology: Man, 38, married. Ph.D., Michigan. 12 years' college teaching, 5 in charge of vertebrate embryology, large Eastern university. Now employed in small Western college. Wishes opportunity to become established in sizable institution emphasizing pre-medical subjects. Sigma Xi. A 2006

A LOW-COST ILLUSTRATION

10-Year Term Insurance

Disability Waiver of Premium Included

At Age	Annual Premium Per \$1,000 Insurance	First Year Cash Dividends*
25	\$ 7.66	\$2.34
35	\$ 9.06	\$2.15
45	\$14.84	\$2.64

* 1942 Dividend Scale. Dividends, while not guaranteed, have been paid every year.

Term Insurance fits only temporary needs. Rates and descriptions of all policies offered will be sent on request. You must take the initiative. We have no agents; the saving goes to you.

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

522 Fifth Avenue

New York

Created and Endowed to Serve the Educational World

**The
BULLETIN**

**American Association
of
University Professors**

AN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL by teachers and investigators stressing articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in or a part of our institutions of higher learning. Current subjects: place and function of faculties in college and university government; faculty-administration relations; freedom of inquiry and expression; tenure; the evaluation of faculty services; professional ethics.

Published bimonthly during the academic year: February, April, June, October, and December. Circulation 15,000.

Subscription \$3.00 a year

American Association of University Professors
1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W.

Washington, D. C.

**Journal of Higher
Education**

**THE MAGAZINE FOR
LEADERS IN COLLEGIATE
EDUCATION**

Subscription \$3 a year

**OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY**

COLUMBUS

For the past twelve years the Journal has been recognized as the leading magazine devoted to matters pertaining to the different areas of higher education. The contents of each issue are varied. The prospectus for the year's issues contains discursive articles, reports of research, and criticisms of current practices. We believe that professors and administrative officers, when once subscribers to the Journal, will find it so satisfying that they will not wish to be without it.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

The Literature of Junior College Terminal Education

By LOIS E. ENGLEMAN and WALTER C. EELLS. Contains more than 1,500 abstracts of articles, bulletins, and theses. Carefully classified and fully indexed. 336 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education

By WALTER C. EELLS, BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD, EDWARD F. MASON and MAX SCHIFERL. Summary of nation-wide investigation on the status of terminal education in more than 400 junior colleges. Copiously illustrated. 350 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Why Junior College Terminal Education?

By WALTER C. EELLS, JOHN W. HARBESON, EDWARD F. MASON, NICHOLAS RICCIARDI, WILLIAM H. SNYDER, and GEORGE F. ZOOK. An analysis of vital economic, social, and educational factors and summary of judgments of almost 2,000 educators and laymen. 390 pages. *\$2.50 per volume.*

Accreditation Requirements for Junior Colleges

Chart showing in compact form essentials of accreditation requirements for junior colleges as formulated by 38 national, regional, and state agencies. Size 24" x 38". *\$0.50 per copy.*

Junior College Journal

Only national periodical devoted exclusively to the rapidly expanding junior-college field. Nine issues, September to May. *\$3.00 per year.*

Complete list of publications on request

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
730 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, edited by Guy E. Snively. Issued four times a year. *\$3.00.*

American Education and World Responsibility—The Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting, 1942. Addresses by Malcolm MacDonald, H. W. Prentiss, Jr., George N. Shuster. Additional articles by Paul V. McNutt, Isaiah Bowman and Guy E. Snively. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (*Bulletin*, March, 1942.) *\$1.50.*

The American Colleges and the Social Order by Robert Lincoln Kelly. An interpretative and critical study of the development of American colleges and college education which gives new perspective to the much discussed problems of higher education today. The Macmillan Company, New York. *\$2.50.*

Teaching with Books—A Study of College Libraries by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, New York, and American Library Association, Chicago. *\$2.50.*

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art. Single copy, *\$1.25*; ten copies, *\$10.00.*

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges by Edward Safford Jones. 434 pages. *\$2.50.*

College Music by Randall Thompson. Report of an investigation of non-professional offerings in typical selected institutions under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation. The Macmillan Company, New York. *\$2.50.*

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.